STUDIES IN JUDAISM

(THIRD SERIES)

STUDIES IN JUDAISM

THIRD SERIES

BY

S. SCHECHTER, M.A., LITT. D.

PHILADELPHIA
THE JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY OF AMERICA
1924

Copyright by
THE JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY OF AMERICA
1924

CONTENTS

	Page
Jewish Saints in Mediaeval Germany	1
"As Others Saw Him". A retrospect, A. D. 54	25
Abraham Geiger	47
Leopold Zunz	84
On the Study of the Talmud	143
The Talmud	194
Notes of Lectures on Jewish Philanthropy	238
Notes	277
Index	307

FOREWORD

THE idea of the publication of the papers collected in this volume as a third series of "Studies in Judaism" originated with Mrs. Solomon Schechter. Shortly after the author's death she went over all his available literary remains and selected those of a more popular nature which are contained in the present volume, as well as a series of lectures on the Genizah which still remain to be published. Three of the papers, viz. "As Others Saw Him", "On the Study of the Talmud" (not to be confused with another paper of the same title in the second series of these "Studies") and "The Talmud" have, as indicated in the notes, already appeared in places not readily accessible to the general reading public. Thanks are due to Messrs. T. & T. Clark, of Edinburgh, for permission to reprint the article on "The Talmud" from Hastings' "A Dictionary of the Bible". Three other essays, viz. "Jewish Saints in Mediaeval Germany", "Abraham Geiger" and "Zunz" are published here for the first time from the author's manuscript. For Dr. Schechter's "Notes on Jewish Philanthropy" acknowledgment is due to Rabbi Jacob Bosniak, one of his pupils, who with devotion and skill collated the notes taken by himself and other students of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America with the notebook of the lecturer.

In preparing this volume for the press the editors have scrupulously avoided making any changes either in language or arrangement except such as in their opinion would have been regarded as essential by the author, who was always most painstaking in the revision of his books for the press. The article on Zunz in particular required a certain amount of rearrangement in view of the fact that it was one of the author's earliest essays in the English language and that it had lain untouched for over a quarter of a century in his desk, where it was discovered with one page missing. For the convenience of the reader the lengthy analyses of Zunz's works have been transferred *in toto* into appendices. A few necessary variations from the manuscript are indicated by square brackets. The author's notes have been published intact with only such additions as would bring them up to date, or as would appear from the manuscript to have been contemplated by Dr. Schechter. In thus revising the notes, however, information easily accessible to any student has, as a rule, not been included. The index has been carefully prepared by Mr. I. George Dobsevage to whom the editors gladly express their indebtedness.

This volume covers the full range of Dr. Schechter's literary activity from the early years of his life in England to his last days in the New World. In offering these essays to the public the editors feel that comment by them on the subject matter would be superfluous. It is the vigor of style, the originality of thought and the depth of learning displayed in these papers that will speak for themselves, and

that, the editors believe, will insure for this third series of "Studies in Judaism" the same cordial welcome, which greeted both of its predecessors.

ALEXANDER MARX
FRANK I. SCHECHTER

New York City, June, 1924.

JEWISH SAINTS IN MEDIAEVAL GERMANY

In the book entitled *Tur Orah Hayyim* (The Path of Life) by R. Jacob b. Asher, which became the prototype of R. Joseph Caro's *Shulhan 'Aruk* there occurs a reference to the "German Saints" (חסידי אשכנז), who interpreted the very dots and traces of writing. The term has become typical, and a certain historical meaning is now attached to it. It is those "German Saints" whom I propose to introduce you to in this paper.

The term Ashkenaz (אשכנז) occurs in the genealogical table of Genesis 10:3, and is identified with a certain tribe located somewhere in Asia. Nevertheless, by a peculiar process of an unexplained folk-etymology, it was identified early in the Middle Ages with Germany.

In later ages, however, the term assumes such proportions as to make it impossible to identify it with any particular spot in Europe. It covers the British Isles, the whole of the north of France, the whole of Germany, a great part of Austria, which was at that time mostly inhabited by Slavonic tribes. Indeed, the term is more suggestive of a civilization than of any geographical delimitations.

This is particularly the case in the thirteenth

and subsequent centuries, when the term Ashkenaz is usually contrasted with Sephard (ספרד), or when one speaks of the Ashkenazim in contradistinction to the Sephardim. The term Sephard extended to the Jewry living under Mohammedan rule, speaking, for the most part, the Arabic language. Through the means of this vernacular, which was also their literary language, they soon made the acquaintance of certain writings of Aristotle, and acquired also some knowledge of medicine, mathematics, astronomy, and other things worth knowing. This fact enabled them to share in all the benefits of higher civilization as represented by the various Caliphs and their refined courts.

The term Ashkenazim embraced the Jewry scattered over the dominions of Christian potentates, where, for the most part, the French or the German vernacular was spoken. These languages were sufficient for the daily needs, but had little or no literature, whilst all knowledge was buried in the vaults of the Latin language (or, as the Jews called it, כתב גלחות, the letters of the clerics or priests). As to the nature of this knowledge it largely consisted of treatises discussing the nature of the different persons of the trinity, the miraculous deeds of the saints, the authorities of the Church, and similar subjects, which had no meaning for the Jew.

German, or to take the more comprehensive name, Ashkenaz Judaism was thus doomed to live in the midst of an inferior civilization at a very early stage of its history. Moreover, this early stage was preceded by another which, as far as their surroundings

were concerned, spelled no civilization at all. I am referring to the legend which fixes the date of the first emigration of Jews to France and Germany in the pre-Christian era. The old Teuton or the ancient Gallic tribes may have been in possession of certain virile virtues, which by reason of contrast recommended them to the degenerate and overcivilized Romans and which as boys we admired so much in the heroes Fennimore Cooper's novels. But of civilization and culture there was none, and least of all had these tribes just released from their Reservations anything to offer to a people which already at that early period could look back upon a commonwealth and a history reaching back for nearly two thousands years and were possessed of a sacred literature which was soon to regenerate the world. Abraham Epstein in discussing the tradition of the early settlements of the Jews in the Rhine provinces disposes of it with the remark that it is mere legend and takes no further notice of it. This is rather simple. For legend is in reality nothing else but a sort of irresponsible history and is thus not necessarily untrue.

It is true that now the first documentary evidence we possess of the settling of the Jews in Germany is only to be found in connection with an edict of Constantine, dated 321. In this he refers to the Jewish community in Cologne, making mention at the same time of the rabbi, the president, and the elders of the synagogue, and other officers of the congregation. But this is certainly no proof that there were no Jews in Germany before that time. System and organization, as we shall presently see, were not the

strong side of the Ashkenaz Jew, and the existence of such a fully equipped congregation as just indicated points to the arrival of the Jews in Germany at a much earlier date than the one just mentioned.

It is therefore no exaggeration to say that the Ashkenaz Jew had the misfortune to live for a time in a country with no civilization at all, and then to come into contact with a civilization of a much inferior kind compared to that which the Sephard Jew enjoyed. The Ashkenaz Jew was therefore for a long time, through no fault of his own, excluded from making those contributions to secular science in which the Sephard Jew excelled at a very early period of his settling in Europe. But he was certainly great in other respects. This greatness was not on the surface, and it required the deeper insight of a Rapoport, Zunz, and Luzzatto to discover it.

Zunz deserves the more credit for his work in this direction, as he lived at a time when the shallow rationalism. which came in the train of the French Revolution, and under which we are still laboring, was so rampant that the German Jew entertained the same feelings towards his own ancestors which some among us still harbor against the Russian and the Polish Jew. The rationalists could not possibly understand that men who neither understood nor misunderstood Aristotle could be worthy of the attention of the historian. They spoke a good deal about Maimonides and his school, in whose works they looked for precedents and support for their own shallow conceptions of Judaism, and in the manner of the present-day Pollack, who will tell you that Kovno is a Ger-

man province, they claimed to be the spiritual descendants of the Sephardim. But they had no eye for the greatness of a Rashi; they were too superficial to appreciate the real scientific method of the Franco-German school as exhibited in its Biblical and Talmudical exegesis; and least of all were they able to appreciate the beauty and religious delicacy of the Jewish saints of Germany, the חסידי אשכנז.

I must refer you to the works of Zunz, Graetz, Weiss and others who, if I may say so, in an Elijah fashion, turned the hearts of the German children to their German fathers and filled a gap of Jewish thought of which men of the temperament of Isaac Euchel and David Friedlaender could hardly dream. Here we shall confine ourselves to the German saints, or to speak in abstract to German-Jewish saintliness.

The best Hebrew equivalent for the term saint is *hasid*, commonly used in the sense of the pious, devout, reverend, godly; but the noun *hesed* is found together with *hen* (חן) and *rahamim* (רחמים), thus implying the qualities of grace, graciousness, gracefulness, and kindliness. Thus we read of Esther: "And the king loved Esther above all the women, and she obtained *hen* and *hesed* in his sight" (Esther 2.17); that is to say, she found grace and kindness in his sight. Of the virtuous woman it is said: "She openeth her mouth with wisdom, and in her tongue is *Torat hesed*, the law of kindness (or graciousness)" (Proverbs 31.26). When God reminds Israel of the honeymoon at the outset of her spiritual career, when she was wedded to the Torah, He says: "I remember thee the grace (חסד)

of thy youth, etc." (Jer.2.2). When an ancient rabbi wanted to be polite to a newly married couple, he would compliment the bride with the words, "beautiful and graceful" (נאה וחסודה). Applied to matters spiritual, the best equivalent for *hasidut* or *hasidim* would be "beautiful souls."

This beauty found its expression in different ways.

The author of the passage forming the opening of this lecture, lived in the middle of the Fourteenth Century, but the saints of which he speaks preceded him by several centuries.

The first glimpse we get of these German saints is, in my opinion, the following passage to be found in the travels of Benjamin of Tudela:

"All the congregations of Alamania are situated on the great river Rhine, from the city of Cologne, which is the principal town of the empire, to the city of Regensburg, a distance of fifteen days' journey at the other extremity of Alamania, otherwise called Ashkenaz. And the following are the cities in the land of Alamania which have Hebrew congregations: Metz, Treves on the river Moselle, Coblenz, Andernach, Bonn, Cologne, Bingen, Münster, Worms. All Israel is dispersed in every land, and he who does not further the gathering of Israel will not meet with happiness nor live with Israel.

"When the Lord will remember us in our exile, and raise the horn of His anointed (משיח), then every one will say: 'I will lead the Jews and I will gather them.' As for the towns which have been mentioned, they contain scholars and communities that love their brethren, and speak

peace to those who are near and far, and when a wayfarer comes, they rejoice, and make a feast for him, and say: 'Rejoice, brethren, for the help of the Lord comes in the twinkling of an eye.' If we were not afraid that the appointed time has not yet been reached, we should have gathered together, but we dare not do so until the time for song has arrived, when the messengers will come and say continually: 'The Lord be exalted.' Meanwhile they send missives to one another, saying: 'Be ye strong in the law of Moses, and do ye, mourners for Zion, and ye, mourners for Jerusalem, entreat the Lord, and may the supplications of those that wear the garments of mourning be received through their merits.'"

Benjamin of Tudela flourished during the last half of the twelfth century. But you will notice that he makes no mention of the great men of Germany, as he does in all the other places which he visited, nor does he in any way refer to the sufferings of the Jews in these countries through the persecutions of the Crusades. This proves that the passage is taken from the account of some traveller who visited Germany in a century when Ashkenaz Jewry was not as yet in possession of great schools, nor had it as yet been subjected to the horrors through which its descendants had to pass. And this could only have been in the ninth or early in the tenth century, when the great Talmudical schools of Germany were still in their infancy. The traits of the German Jew, as depicted here, were then, first, hospitality, which is an essential feature of the life of the Jewish Hasid—you have only to think of the "Deeds of loving-kindness"

(גמילות חסדים)—and secondly, their attachment to the Holy Land and expectation of the speedy advent of the Redeemer.

Indeed, it is a remarkable fact in the history of German Jewry that, in spite of their greater distance from Palestine, they were in closer connection with the authorities of the Holy Land than their brethren of Spain and Portugal. As a proof of this it will be sufficient to refer here to the correspondence of the wise men of the Rhine provinces with the heads of the schools of Palestine at an early period of the ninth century. But more important is the fact that certain features in the Ashkenaz prayer-book show more affinity with the ritual and custom of Palestine than the Sephard prayer-book. This latter borrowed its most important features from the Babylonian schools, who provided it with a regular order of prayer. The hymnology or Mahzor of the German Jews consisted largely of hymns and songs in the praise of the Most High, composed by Palestinian authors, such as the productions of Kalir, Yannai, and others, which the Sephardim abandoned at a very early stage of their history.

This brings us to the subject of prayer and song (שירה). Under songs and prayer we have to understand all those manifestations of the soul in which the individual attempts to reciprocate his revelation of the Divine. As was pointed out by a certain writer with regard to the Bible, its unique character consists in furnishing us with both the revelation of God to man, as given in the Pentateuch and in the Prophets, and the revelation of man to God, as contained in the

Psalms and other portions of the Scriptures of a liturgical nature. Hence the value attached to prayer by the saint, who longs for the moments when he can pour out his soul before God in adoration and supplication. And nowhere was this longing more intense, more durable, than with the Ashkenaz saints. How dearly they loved prayer! When the hordes of the Crusades reached Xanten (June 27, 1140), a small town in the neighborhood of the Rhine, the Jews of that place were dining together, partaking of their Sabbath-eve meal. The message of the arrival of the Crusaders meant certain death to the Jews, and the meal was naturally discontinued. But they did not leave the hall until the saint, R. Moses ha-Cohen, first said grace, using the regular text and adding to it matter appropriate to the occasion. The grace was concluded with the *Shema'*. Thereupon they went to the Synagogue, where they all met with martyrdom.

And how dearly they loved their prayer-book! The saints of Germany, according to the testimony of R. Jacob b. Asher, were in the habit of weighing and counting the very words of the prayers and the benedictions. The product of this weighing and counting is a large literature in the shape of commentaries on the Jewish liturgy. It was especially the more difficult portions of the Mahzor which occupied their attention. The number of such commentators is not less than seventy-three, extending over many centuries and including the greatest names of Ashkenaz Israel.

And just as they loved to interpret the pray-

ers so were they fond of composing prayers themselves, of which the German Mahzor, with its large dimensions, bears evidence. These prayers are known under the name of Piyyutim, or poetical pieces, serving as a sort of hymnal-book. Though these poetical pieces were composed by the greatest authorities of the Synagogue, they never arrogated the place of the *Siddur*, or the regular prayer-book. The prayer-book remained sacred to them, no man daring or willing to alter a single iota in the original text, the great inheritance of the Synagogue and the source of inspiration and unity of Catholic Israel.

The Piyyutim were, as it would seem, recited and introduced by the composers themselves, who were the rabbis of the community, holding at the same time the office of the Hazzanim of their congregations. It is sufficient here to mention the name of Rabbi Meir b. Isaac, the teacher of Rashi, who was a Hazzan. The famous Rabbenu Gershon was also a Hazzan. This was another feature of the saints of Ashkenaz, who considered it a privilege to conduct the service in the capacity of *Sheliah Zibbur* or the "Messenger of the Congregation." In Spain it was a salaried office. Likewise the office of blowing the shofar was salaried in Spain. This called forth the indignation of R. Jehiel b. Asher, who said: "With us in Germany it is the most prominent men of the community who are eager to perform this function, whilst in Spain they flee from fulfilling the commandment, so that they are compelled to hire one from the street to accomplish this duty for them." He proceeds to say: "One sin brings in its train another sin, for the man

who allows himself to be paid for this function is practically doing a business on a sacred day, which is forbidden by the Law."

From the literary point of view the merit of these liturgical productions by the saints of Ashkenaz is certainly not very great. They are wanting in literary grace, faulty in grammar, and awkward in their diction and can by no means be compared with the similar productions of the Sephardic schools, with their fine artistic finish and perfection of style. But on the other hand, they have a depth of feeling and a certain inwardness, *Gemüt*, which is hardly to be found with poets of the Synagogue of any other school. It is especially the hymns for the various Sabbaths between the Passover and the Feast of Weeks which reveal a religious fervour and a love for God knowing no bounds, and shrinking from no sacrifice, unequalled in any other literature.

Altogether, the German Jew may be described in the Carlylian phrase, as the "Great Inarticulate". Luzzatto somewhere remarked that it was rarely given to the Jew to write a systematic piece of work reproducing all his thought in a methodical way. The strength of the Jew rather lay according to him in occasional notes and stray remarks and abrupt flashes of thought. This is certainly an exaggeration, but it may well be applied to the old Ashkenaz Jew. No student of the Franco-German school could ever have been able to produce such a book as Maimonides' *Mishne Torah*. This gigantic work, accomplished the miracle of bringing system into the Rabbinical chaos,

and reducing all Talmudical matter with its thousands of laws and precendents and discussions into a regular Code. But on the other hand, no Sephardic author would ever have succeeded in writing such a Commentary to the Talmud as Rashi did, which has become indeed the model commentary for all times. It is short, precise, and pursuing no other aim but that of conveying to us the real meaning of the author whose interpreter it is intended to be. To a certain extent this was a consequence of the German Chasiduth. The Ashkenaz Jew neither knew nor recognized any other authority besides that of the Torah and of tradition, and had thus no need of re-interpretation or reconcilation of the views of the Scriptures and our sages with those advanced by any Greek philosopher. Quite different was the case of the Sephardic Jew. He was as a rule as much of a devotee of Aristotle as of a believer in the words of the Torah and the views of the Rabbis. He thus, consciously or unconsciously, labored under the difficulty of harmonizing contradictory views, rarely to be accomplished without doing violence either to the works of the philosopher or to the text of the Scriptures and the Talmud. This proved in the course of history one of the greatest weakness of the Sephardic school. Most of their commentaries to the Bible have now become entirely obsolete, whilst one can still study with profit and advantage the Biblical exegesis of R. Solomon b. Isaac, R. Samuel b. Meier, R. Joseph Bekor Shor, and Rabbi Joseph Caro.

Meekness and humility are another feature of saintliness,—again best to be seen in the commen-

taries of the Ashkenaz Jews, especially those of Rashi, with their entire subordination of the commentator to his author. Whether his author is wrong or right, his task as a commentator only consisted in conveying to us the exact meaning of his text. The Sephardic Jew, on the other hand, would very often compel his author to be right, that is, to agree with him. This was again a consequence of the undivided love of the German Jew for his authorities. It can best be illustrated by the well-known story of the two men who both loved their wives dearly, but the one loved her because she admired him, and the other because he admired her. Rashi loved his author because he admired him. Where he could not fathom the meaning of his author he would straightforwardly say: "I do not understand this," or "this escaped me," or "this is beyond me," and similar phrases expressive of the qualities of "a humble mind and a lowly spirit."

This is the feature which runs through almost the whole of the literary products of the German Jews, their commentaries as well as their Responsa. In these Responsa, especially, one will find such phrases as these forming the close of the letters: "These are the words of the poor one", "the humble one", "the threshold trodden by the feet of the sages"; whilst the Sephardic Jew would as a rule conclude his legal decisions with the mere formula, "So wrote, N. N". These expressions of humility and meekness with men like Rashi or R. Meir of Rothenburg, or Isaac Or Zarua were not mere phrases.

But meekness and humility must by no means

be confused with self-abasement and a tendency to cringing. The Ashkenaz Jew certainly knew how to hold his own, when meeting with the Sephardi, who would occasionally taunt him with his ignorance of secular science. This was best seen in the case of the famous R. Asher b. Jehiel, whom persecution drove to leave Germany. He emigrated then to Toledo, where he soon became the rabbi of that community and the recognized authority all over Spain. The brothers Israeli, from whom, I think, the famous English Premier Disraeli derived his pedigree, soon became his most devoted disciples, and so also did other men of standing in the political and scientific world. His opinions and decisions became law in all the land of proud Castile, even when they contradicted the decisions of Maimonides.

Some years ago it was my good fortune to discover the will of his son, R. Judah, who succeeded him in his office. In this will his son is careful to tell us how proud he is of his German descent, and that the emigration of his family to Spain must by no means be ascribed to some dishonorable cause. It was merely owing to the persecutions to which R. Meir of Rothenburg, who died in prison, was subjected, and to which his father, the disciple of R. Meir, was to be subjected after the death of his master. Indeed, after his flight from his native country, the magistrate of the place from which he came sent him a petition to return home, offering to procure for him a safe conduct from the king, but he would not return on account of the frequency of the

persecutions in Germany. The German princes of that time could not well be trusted. The imprisonment of rabbis was with them a regular trade. They would throw the rabbi into jail and then tax the community with heavy ransom. The R. Meir just mentioned preferred to die in prison rather than allow the encouragement of rapacity on the part of the princes.

As we can further see from this will of Rabbi Asher's son, as well as from the Responsa of R. Asher himself, he in no way felt overawed by the superiority of his new surroundings in the department of philosophy. He tells them in so many words: "As to our secular sciences, blessed be the Merciful Who saved me from them, for their arguments only serve to remove men from the fear of God and His Law. As long as I live there is still law in Israel. The Torah is the inheritance of the Jews of Ashkenaz in a direct line from the days of the Temple."

It is interesting to see in the above-mentioned will how his son, R. Judah, still retained his antiquated German prejudices, and could never reconcile himself to the idea of accepting a remuneration for his services to the community as rabbi and teacher. As the community insisted on his accepting the salary, he saved up all the money which he received from his congregants, and converted it in his will into a bequest for various educational and charitable purposes of which his Jewish fellow-citizens were in need. The greatness of the Asher family seems, among other things, to have consisted also in their ability to starve when poverty was a virtue. R. Jacob, the brother of R. Judah, the author

of the *Turim* and other works, was so poor that we find him consulting with his father as to the dress and meals on the Sabbath-day, in which, on account of his poverty, he was unable to make any distinction in honor of the day. But this did not prevent him from writing the just mentioned *Turim* which is still counted among the authoritative works of first-rank in the synagogue.

The frequency of persecutions referred to by R. Judah is a long and sad story. Indeed, the persecutions from the times of the first Crusades in 1096 till perhaps the end of the fifteenth century are so continuous that we can hardly speak of frequency, which at least suggests moments for breath and recuperation. Confiscation followed confiscation, massacre followed massacre, and expulsion followed expulsion so closely during all these terrible centuries that it is the greatest miracle how the Ashkenaz Jew survived them.

However, I do not intend to harrow the reader with pictures of torture and description of massacres. Those who feel a special interest in the subject can easily find them in such works as the Hebrew accounts of the persecutions of the Jews during the Crusades, published by Neubauer and Stern and accompanied by a German translation, and in the bulky collection of the various lists of martyrs, compiled by Salfeld. They are terrible reading, haunting us in our dreams, and making us ashamed to see that we are now wilfully permitting the things for which our ancestors joyfully gave their lives to fall into decay, which must end in ultimate ruin. But whatever may be the effect of the reading of the litera-

ture of the ages just mentioned with regard to our high opinion of ourselves, it will certainly result in being proud of our ancestors. For it is amidst all these persecutions, and this terrible distress, that Ashkenaz Judaism reveals itself in all its heroism and saintly qualities. It was Ashkenaz Judaism which introduced a regular benediction for the occasion when man is facing martyrdom, running thus: "Blessed art Thou, O Lord, our God, King of the Universe, who has sanctified us by Thy commandments and bade us love Thy glorious and awful Name Who was and is and will be, with all our heart and all our soul, and to sanctify Thy Name in public. Blessed art Thou O Lord who sanctifies Thy Name among the many."

However, as just indicated, I do not intend to dwell on these martyrdoms, and shall devote the next few paragraphs to the saintly lives of the Ashkenaz rabbis. I am thinking of that aspect of saintliness which cannot be measured by the standard of the law. For it is one of the characteristics of the saint that he never wants for a distinctive commandment. The various precepts of the Bible are for him so many memoranda, or head-lines, each leading to new trains of thought and suggestive of any number of inferences. "Who is a saint?" a mystic asserts. "He who acts kindly with his Maker," or as the Rabbis expressed it in their more prosaic language, "who sanctifies himself even in things permitted."

"Go," the saint says, "go beyond the mere letter of duty. Be not content with avoiding what is clearly illicit, deny thyself something of what is allowed; for so thou shalt sanctify thy life,

and make it a holy service of God." And thus the famous 'fence', which the rabbis erected around the religious citadel, is extended. Human restrictions, voluntary, self-imposed, are to keep the divine precepts safe from violation. It is an austere principle, no doubt, foreign to the temper of our age; but it is a noble principle, and one that must be taken into account if we are to understand the morality of a bygone day.

Most prominent among the leaders of the holiness movement were, as it was to be expected, the Ashkenaz saints, many of whom were also avowed mystics. Mysticism is not an esoteric plant on the soil of Judaism, as some of our platitudinarians believe. There was always a certain tendency towards mysticism in Judaism of one kind or another. The Spanish school had its own mysticism, which was more of the intellectual kind and developed into a quasi-philosophy. That of German Judaism was more of the theosophic brand, and led to worship.

But what was common to both the Spanish and German schools was that they remained loyal to the Law and rarely degenerated into throwing off the yoke of the Torah. Jewish mysticism never beheld, as did the Apostle Peter, the famous vessel descending from heaven where all manner of four-footed beasts and creeping things of the earth and fowl of the air were contained, which was the signal to the abolition of the dietary laws. Quite the reverse, the tendency of Jewish mysticism was in the direction of self-denial, which developed into an austere life and renunciation of all appetites as far as it was com-

patible with the spirit of the Torah, which held always the right balance between the flesh and the spirit, ignoring neither.

This austerity, however, in no way hardened these saints or deprived them of that sympathy and kindliness which we would hardly expect from men leading an ascetic life. They were full of *Gemüt*, most severe against themselves and most lenient towards their neighbors. This conception of conduct is particularly prominent in the so-called Hasidim Literature. I am referring to the "Book of the Saints" (ספר חסידים) by Rabbi Judah he-Hasid, the son of R. Samuel he-Hasid, and the short "Book of the Saints," by R. Moses b. Eliezer ha-Kohen. The former particularly abounds in orders of penance for the sinner which are of a most severe nature, but at the same time full of the most humane precepts. Here are a few specimens:

"Mention always the name of thy neighbor before thine own, and say: 'My friend and myself'."

"Be not jealous of the man who is greater than thou and despise none who is smaller than thou."

"If thou hast a guest, never speak to him about learned matters unless thou knowest he is able to partake in the conversation."

"Never put to shame thy man-servant or thy maid-servant."

"The man who is cruel to animals will have to answer for it on the Day of Judgment, and the very drivers will be punished for applying the spur too often."

"Those who constantly fast are not in the good way. Scribes, teachers, and workmen are altogether

forbidden to inflict penance upon themselves. If the Holy One, blessed be He, had any particular delight in much fasting, He would have commanded it to Israel; but He only asked of them that they should serve Him in humility."

"If a man should ask: 'Behold, I have money; shall I buy a Scroll of the Law for it or shall I distribute it to the destitute poor?' Answer him with the words of Isaiah: 'When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him, and hide not thyself from thine flesh.'"

"If a man sees a non-Jew committing a sin, let him protest against it if he has the power to do so; for behold, did not the Holy One, blessed be He, send the prophet Jonah to the people of Nineveh that they may do repentance?"

"The Holy One, blessed be He, executes the judgment of the oppressed, whether Jew or Christian, hence cheat not anybody."

Moses b. Eliezer ha-Kohen writes:

"Keep thyself removed from everything that is ugly and which even appears as ugly. Be chaste in all thy ways, when thou risest, when thou liest down, when thou sittest and when thou walkest."

"Be ever careful to feed the poultry in thy house before thou takest thy meal."

"Keep thyself supplied with the various fruits which the Lord has created, so that thou mayest praise Him for every particular kind. For indeed, man will give account and reckoning for everything which he saw and did not taste, if permitted to him."

"If thy friend is about to buy a house, a book, an ornament, or even fruit, do not compete with him

until thou knowest that he gave up all thought of buying it."

"Know the God of thy Fathers, and serve Him in every possible way, even at the risk of thy fortune."

"Be careful never to cheat a non-Jew or to deceive anybody in any way, for such things are worse than eating pork; pork being forbidden by only one prohibitive commandment, while the cheating of a non-Jew involves the transgression of many laws, especially those connected with the desecration of the Name of the Lord."

"Never keep back thy mercy and compassion from any thing which the Holy One, blessed be He, created in this world, be it even a dog or a cat or a creeping thing, or even a fly or a wasp. Imitate thy Maker, and feed them, for it is written, 'The Lord is good to all and His tender mercies are over all His works.' It is also said of God that 'He gives food to all flesh, for His mercy endureth for ever'."

"Be very careful not to say an untruth even in the way of a joke, or an overstatement, the Scripture constantly warning against it, in the Torah and in the Prophets and in the Hagiographa."

"Look over the particular portion of the Scripture and the Liturgy assigned for each season. Neglect not from repeating and studying everything in its time."

The good Rabbi Salman of the fourteenth century has, in his will, the injunction: "Be honest and conscientious in your dealings with men, with Jews as well as Gentiles; be kind and obliging to them; do not speak what is superfluous." We have still to discover a will of a Christian of the same century who

would bid his son at least not to murder Jews. The literature of ethical wills is altogether a remarkable one and called forth the admiration and astonishment of a Christian professor of the eighteenth century, who suddenly made the discovery that the Jews actually knew something of morality and ethics.

I must not omit mentioning R. Eliezer b. Jehudah of Worms, the well known author of the book *Rokeah* the greatest perhaps of the disciples of R. Jehudah he-Hasid. He was a strict legalist, as may be seen from the book just mentioned, but at the same time, a thorough mystic. As most of the Chasidim, he passed through the severe tests of the suffering in the age of the Crusades. "On the fatal day in November 1196 the Soldiers of the Cross burst into his house, as he was engaged in writing his commentary on Genesis, plundered it of its contents, cruelly maltreated his wife and then murdered her and their children. The Rabbi alone escaped with bare life." The key to his mysticism is the well-known injunction of his, which is partly derived from the old Rabbinical literature: "Know that the Holy One is within thee." But this suggestive immanence never degenerated with him into the fleshly excesses of the lawless mystics. "For, he continues, "therefore let thy life be one of holiness and self-denial. The very mention of God's awful name should make all thy limbs tremble. Fix thy mind upon the Almighty when thou standest before Him in prayer, and should some alien thought come to thee in thy devotions, be silent until thy heart is joined once more in reverence to thy Creator. Say to thyself whilst thou prayest, 'How honored am I

in being suffered to offer a crown to the King of Glory!—I, who am but clay; I will rend the bonds of my heart, and in awe and humility will I enter the Divine Gates.' But this consciousness of the nearness of God led with him not less to the love of God. Thus he pleads with his readers:

"My son, hearken to my voice; love the Lord thy God. Let thy heart know Him, and declare His unity. Do thy work until eventide; but remember to love Him at *all* times. See, He stands before thee! He is thy Father, thy Master, thy Maker; submit thyself to Him. Ah, happy is he whose heart trembleth with the joy of God and is forever singing to its Maker! He bears patiently the divine yoke, he is humble and self-denying, he scorns the world's vain pleasures, he lives by his faith, he has gentle speech for all, he rejoices in the joys of others, he loves his neighbor, and does charity in secret."

I have spoken of the persecution of the German Jews or of Ashkenaz Judaism, which formed one long chain of suffering from about the end of the eleventh century until the end of the fifteenth. This statement requires some modification. For the persecutions under one form or another continued until about the end of the eighteenth century, when they suffered a break through the intervention of the French Revolution.

It is, however, not to be denied that the sixteenth century saw some little abating of the persecutions, and this for the simple reason that there were not sufficient Jews to persecute on a large scale. The German kings and princes continued to be as cruel and as rapacious as they had ever been, but the

Jews became fewer. The distress of the fifteenth century was so great that Ashkenaz Jewry at last began to scatter and seek refuge in Turkey under the mild government of the Ottoman sultans, but chiefly in Poland, in which the greatest numbers found an asylum. But for this fact, we would have had now a German Pale with six or seven millions of Jews, with a Jewish-German problem before us, instead of a Jewish-Russian one. And this might have been perhaps worse. For it is easier to fight savagery and barbarity than to grapple with that subtle and philosophic "Hep, Hep!" which is so characteristic of the German, and is even now driving more Jews to the baptismal font than the Russian and Roumanian massacres. Thus the Exodus from Germany, by a merciful Providence, began in the sixteenth century, and the great German names are now to be found in the land of the Poles, and, except R. Meir Schiff, Germany could not boast, in the last three centuries before the French Revolution, even of a famous Talmudist. Such famous rabbis as they had were all imported from Poland. The nineteenth century finds German Judaism practically powerless and prostrated, and this will explain many a phenomenon connected with our spiritual history during the nineteenth century.

However, it would be invidious for me to enlarge upon the subject. My intention was only to make one acquainted with an aspect of German Judaism not generally known. And so let us praise God that we have lived to see better times, but we must never forget the German saints.

"AS OTHERS SAW HIM"

A Retrospect, A. D. 54

The theological novel, as embodied in the numerous Lives and Times of Jesus, is a product of a comparatively late date. The Gospel of John, which is considered by some critics to represent a sort of Hellenistic spiritual romance, found little imitation. Nor, indeed, could it. When the pagan world of antiquity accepted Jesus, it meant in no wise to play at hero-worship. The Greeks as well as the Romans had quite a respectable number of heroes of their own make, and there was no need for a change in this respect. What the world yearned after was God, and if Jesus should receive the homage of mankind, he had to become a God for all theological purposes.

But who would, who could, be so presumptuous as to write the life of a god? The very thought is blasphemous. As a German theologian expressed it, *Das Leben Jesu ist der Tod Christi.* Life associates with itself death, and suggests even to the untutored mind a career brought to an end. It was not, therefore, until this century, when the divinity of Christ began to be questioned and the doctrine of incarnation was by all sorts of German-Indian dialectics reduced to a shadow of its original meaning, so that the belief in it offers fewer difficulties to the semi-atheist than to those who "preach no system nebulous

and new, God is or is not", that the life of Christ became a subject of inquiry, and students would make the attempt to write it.

But the difficulties to be overcome are too great. The times are too remote, the documents too scarce and insufficient—extending only over the last three years of Jesus' life—and full of contradictions and discrepancies, whilst the contemporary literature of the Jews, who are supposed to have been both the target of his wrath and the object of his pity and prayers, has not left us a single reference to this controversy. Apart from these facts, there was always a desire among these writers to display more of the artist than of the biographer. Whether conservative or liberal, they aimed more at edifying their respective audiences than at making them acquainted with the real events of the time.

For this reason, instead of writing history, these "biographers" of Jesus endeavor to draw pictures of perfection, the notion of which varies with each country. To name here only the two most popular of these romances—whilst the solemn and rather forbidding Jesus of our *Ecce Homo* has something of the Rugby hero about him, in whom the severe morality and stern truthfulness almost crush the sympathetic and pathetic elements, the subject of Renan's *Vie de Jésus* reminds one more of the beautiful soul—a sort of Amiel with less speculation and more faith—who compensates for his few common weaknesses by his boundless compassion and generosity. Thus we have an English Jesus, a French Jesus, and so many more national Jesuses whom it would be super-

fluous to introduce here. But where is the only true Jesus, the Jesus of the Jews?

The Gospels give no adequate answer to this question. In spite of the tendency common to all critics to attribute every unpleasant feature in the history of Jesus to the Judaic shortcomings of his disciples, they represent as little real Jewish opinion as the divinity of the Fifth-Monarchy men or the Adventists can be said to be a true expression of English or American thought. They, the adherents of Jesus, belonged to a little band of Separatists, a new kind of Pharisees, but who were recruited from the lower class of the nation and with whom the exposure and abuse of the scholars, the judges, the elders, and other leaders of the nation formed, as it would seem, as much a part of their edifying conversation as the miraculous stories of their Master.

But what did the nation at large, to which all these representative classes belonged, think of the Jesuite movement—in other words: How did others see him? To answer this question, an attempt is made in the new theological romance which has lately appeared under the title "As Others Saw Him: A Retrospect, A. D. 54".

The Other who saw him is Meshullam ben Zadok, "a scribe of the Jews in Alexandria" and a former member of the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem who, in a sort of memoir, intended to satisfy the curiosity of his Greek friend, Aglaophonos, physician at Corinth, tries to give a connected account of the events relating to the activity of Jesus and his death, which he witnessed some twenty years before.

We will point out at once that the romance which will occupy us in this place is small in size, so that there is no objection to its perusal on this head, and we further assure the reader that he will find in it many excellent things and fresh features for which he will look in vain in the cognate theologico-romantic productions of a much larger bulk. The most original part of our work in which Meshullam saw matters in a different light from that in which so many others saw them, is Chapter VIII, the Rebuking of Jesus. In this chapter is treated the incident of Jesus' invitation by a Pharisee to dine with him (Luke 11.37, and parallels). Meshullam's memory is in the right when he describes the occasion as a "religious meal" (*Seudat Mitzvah*), though we greatly doubt that it was a Barmitzvah meal, as this whole ceremony and everything connected with it dates probably from a much later period. The question of eating bread with unwashed hands was brought up at this dinner, and resulted in fierce invectives by Jesus against the Pharisees.

Exception has been taken by some theological writers to this strange behavior of Jesus towards his host and his Pharisaic friends. Renan ascribes this lack of good manners to "one of the principal defects in the Jewish race in which harshness in controversy and the abusive tone which it always infuses in it" are so characteristic. Dr. Martineau gets over the difficulty by declaring the story apocryphal, as being incongruous with the character of Jesus. With Dr. Martineau's three "critical rules", the history of Jesus can mould itself to any

form. On the other hand, the author of *Ecce Homo* accounts for it by a new "law of resentment", according to which "he who would make allowance for the publican and prostitute, made no allowance at all for the Pharisee". Thus, the Pharisee has no claim to a gentle and polite treatment.

More important, however, than the question of politeness is that of the truth of the accusation brought by Jesus against the Pharisees—of hypocrisy, of doing good work only for the sake of gaining favor with the people, of plundering the poor, of robbing the widows, and of murdering the prophets. The novelist just quoted (the author of *Ecce Homo*) says indeed that "we have not the evidence before us which might enable us to verify this accusation", but he slips over the difficulty by quoting the French *aperçu:* "*La petite morale est l'ennemi de la grande*", followed by a long catalogue of the sins of the Pharisees (according to the Gospels) and winding up his long dissertation with the exclamation: "We must remember that this is He who was called a Lamb." This is very edifying, but is it history? The historian would derive from this action of Jesus that the epithet of "lamb" was wrongly applied to him; and if he would attempt to reproduce the outraged sentiments of those present, he could certainly not put them in more emphatic terms than those with which Simon ben Lazarus gave vent to his wounded feelings:–

"Young man, fourscore years and two have I lived upon this earth; a Pharisee have I been from the day I became a son of the covenant, like little Lazarus there; a scribe was I during all the working

days of my life. I did what the Law and the Sages command, yet never thought I in doing so of men's thoughts or praises. Surely, if the Lord command, a good Jew will obey. And as in many things, many acts of this life, the Law speaketh not in plain terms, surely we should follow the opinion of those who devote all their life to the study of the Law.

"I have never sought the praise of men, their greetings or their honors, in obeying the Law. In all that I have done, I have sought one thing—to fulfil the will of our Father which is in heaven.

"As for what thou sayest, that inward thought and outward act should go together in the service of God and man, that is a verity, and often have I heard the saying from the great Hillel—may his memory be for a blessing! But if outward act may be clean when inward thought may be unclean, how, on the other hand, can we know the purity of what is within, except it be decided by the cleanliness of what is without? How, above all, shall we teach our little ones, like my Lazarus there, to feel what is good and seemly, except by first teaching them to do the acts that are seemly and good?

"And as for what thou sayest as to the hypocrisy of us Pharisees and scribes, I say unto thee—and in a few days I must see the face of my Maker—I say unto thee, I have known many an Ebionite, which thou seemest to be, who was well-spoken within but ill-doing without. So, too, I have known many a scribe and many a Pharisee who neither carried their good deeds on their shoulders nor said: 'Wait, I have to finish some godly deed', nor set off their good deeds against their

sins; nor boasted of their sacrifices or godly works; nor did they seek out their sins that they might pay for them by their virtues; nor were they Pharisees from fear of the Divine punishment. They were Pharisees from love of the Lord, and did throughout their life what they knew to be His commands" (pp. 101–103).

Si sic omnia! Meshullam does not always remain true to himself, and occasionally he appears in the light of such a devotee that it is difficult to see why his editor took the trouble at all to publish his account and did not at once refer us to the narrative of the Gospels or rather to some modern *réchauffée* of it, as the "Philo-Christus" or some other semi-rational life of Christ.

Two things, however, must be borne in mind when reading *As Others Saw Him*. First, that Meshullam's memoir dates from 54 A. D. Meshullam seems to have waked to the import of the event to which he bears witness only through the missionary activity of Paul, which is some twenty years after the death of Jesus. He, therefore, did not write fresh from sight but from memory, which we have good reason to suspect was already impaired, so that occasionally he not only confused the facts but even unconsciously invented new ones to fill up the gaps due to his own forgetfulness.

Secondly, that Meshullam is not a real "Other." Though a Jew and a member of the Sanhedrin, he is not free from Hellenistic tendencies, having been a pupil of a Greek physician and, like his master, a citizen of the Kosmos (p. 17), whilst later in life he

left his country for Alexandria, the capital of Hellenism, from which his letter to Aglaophonos is dated. This will account for the fact that the interpretations which he gave to events are sometimes quite foreign to the spirit of his nation.

We think that Meshullam's memory was decidedly at fault when he professed to have been present when Jesus turned over the tables of the money-changers, whom he then scourged out from the Temple, expelling at the same time those who had for sale doves as sacrifices for the poor. But it was this act that Jesus repeated on a later occasion (pp. 133-135), which, according to Meshullam, drew upon him the jealousy and hatred of the high priest, whose great riches came mainly from the sale of animals for sacrifices, in which he had a share (p. 6). This jealousy resulted, as it is hinted to us (in chapter xiv), in a sort of conspiracy formed by the High Priest and his partisans, which influenced the verdict of the Sanhedrin condemning Jesus to death.

Meshullam is, of course, only anticipating. But we are convinced that a Jewish contemporary of Jesus would have thought the whole story greatly exaggerated if not entirely invented. As an inhabitant of Jerusalem, Meshullam must have been aware that neither beasts of sacrifice nor doves were sold in the Temple, but either in some stables in or outside the city, or on the Mount of Olives. In the Temple itself there was hardly room for such cattle markets as were required by the demands of the pilgrims and of the residents of Jerusalem, even if reduced to the pitiful numbers estimated by Chwolson, which are certainly very low.[1]

Even with regard to the money-changers, there are still grave doubts whether they had their stalls in Jerusalem or in the Temple. The former is the more likely, since we know it was deemed so high a duty to keep out from the holy place everything incompatible with the rules of propriety and decorum, that a law was enacted forbidding visitors to enter the Temple while bearing their money-belts about them. There may have been occasional exceptions, but doubtless, these were managed in such a way that there could be no wounding of the innate "Awe of the Sanctuary".

Besides, as everyone who has read the tractate *Middot* or *Tamid* knows, the organization of the Temple was so perfect and the discipline so strict (each inch of space having its prescribed use and every transaction in it being conducted by appointed officers only), that it is hardly credible that an unofficial person would have been allowed to disturb its order or that those who were affected by this disturbance would have allowed themselves to be scourged out of the place allotted to them by the proper authorities.

In a well-disciplined society in which every member received his orders from the chief official neither the scourge nor even quotations from the Bible are the proper means to effect a reform. The reformer would first apply to a proper court, which alone had the power of altering the regulations. In fact, when R. Simon b. Gamaliel resented the high price to which the pigeons required for sacrifice had been run up and even took an oath that he would not rest till the evil should be removed, he did not

act in a high-handed way—by scourge and abusive language—but applied to the proper authorities, the Bet Din, and procured from it the decision that not so many sacrifices are required in certain cases as the worshippers believe; by which means, indeed, he soon attained his end—the value of pigeons having soon after dropped to a fraction of the former price.

The whole story of the Gospels must, as already suggested by some authorities, be reduced to this: Jesus, on his way to the temple, passed the money-changers, who, for the convenience of the pilgrims, had their stalls in the *neighborhood* of the Temple Mount, and, resenting their bargainings, passed some censure upon them, which, of course, had no further consequences for the order of the Temple.

Nor would a contemporary permit the accusation brought by Meshullam against the high priest Hanan and his ecclesiastical friends to be considered a just one. Heaven knows that we have very few prejudices in favor of ecclesiastics or priests of any description or age. Some high priests were very obnoxious indeed—rapacious, office-seeking, above all, grasping after authority and certainly not very scrupulous as to the means employed for obtaining it. "Woe unto me," exclaimed a certain Rabbi, "because of the house of Hanan and their intrigues. Woe unto me, because of the house of Ishmael b. Phiabi, who are themselves High Priests,—their sons treasurers —their sons-in-law prefects of the Temple—while their slaves beat the people with sticks."

But not the exclamation of a rabbi, nor the

hypothesis of a Dérenbourg, nor even the subtle ingenuity of a Chwolson is weighty enough to condemn them of a judicial murder. As far as sources go, there is not the slightest hint that the priests controlled the trade in sacrificial animals or had any share in it.[2]

It was on this occasion that Meshullam first discovered that light in the eyes of Jesus which changed so quickly from flashing scorn on the money-changers to so tender a glance upon the little child (p. 4), and that the gaze of his eyes caused Meshullam to feel as if all his being were laid bare and all his secret thoughts and sins revealed to them as if they were in communion with the *Shekinah* or Glory itself (p. 84).

These are personal impressions to which Meshullam is most welcome. But from an admirer to a believer is only a short step, and he is so much carried away by these eyes, that he discerns in them that shining light of prophecy "by which we know that a man is a *Nabi*" (p. 20). If Meshullam says it, we will believe him. There are even legends to the effect that the Messiah will be known by the light which will shine upon him. But we may remark that R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos, a contemporary of the apostles, also possessed this gift, "his face shining like the sun and emitting rays of light like that of Moses when he was expounding the Torah". Yet, he was only recognized as a great sage, not as a prophet. At a later period, we meet with Nathan of the Light, so called on account of the halo surrounding his head; but it is not known that he claimed the gift of prophecy, though he was considered a great saint.

However, a believer cannot be expected to trouble himself about such niceties as the distinction between the sage, who is only interpreting the word of God, and the prophet who is himself the chosen implement for its revelation. But Meshullam passes soon from this humble *rôle* to that of an important witness bearing evidence to the miraculous powers of Jesus. His words are: "Now as he (Jesus) began to live his life among the people, he began to do many signs and wonders, like all our great leaders and prophets. Indeed, we say, never shall a man be accounted a prophet unless he can do wonders" (p. 26).

Now, there is little objection to the fact in itself. In the time of Jesus, miraculous cures and other wonders were at least as frequent as, let us say, successful surgical operations in our day. But, before and after Jesus, many a Jew enjoyed the privilege of interfering with the laws of nature. Just about the time of Jesus, there existed a whole order —the Essenes—who were addicted to wonder-working and who, we imagine, occasionally left their settlements with the purpose of exhibiting their supernatural powers in villages and provincial towns, for the benefit of their admirers. What I object to is that Meshullam reduced these miracles of Jesus to a minimum, confining his report to the miracle of Jesus' driving out demons by fixing his eyes on the sufferer, "when, behold! a great calm would come upon the man or woman who were possessed of evil spirits" (p. 27), but omitting all mention of cures of such bodily ailments as leprosy, fevers, dropsy, blindness, and deafness.

Nor does Meshullam allude to any miracles relating to the lower animals and to inanimate nature, such as destroying the swine, the feeding of five thousand men with seven loaves, walking upon the sea, stilling the tempest and turning the water into wine. On the miracle of miracles—the raising of the dead—he is entirely mute. In the suppression of these important facts, which could not be forced into the sympathy or gaze theory, Meshullam is only anticipating our modern Gospel-compilers, whose great principle in dealing with these ancient documents seems to be that "whilst we cannot too strongly insist that the student should approach these great authorities with a proper reverential and devotional mind, he must on the other hand give credence to exactly as much as he finds convenient and not more".

Not less anticipatory is Meshullam when he assures us that Jesus neither used exorcism or magic in his healing, nor spoke in the name of God, but with the tone of one having authority in himself. This interpretation is decidedly in the spirit of Wellhausen and other writers of the same school, who resent so much that "in the Synoptics Jesus appears as a thaumaturge". But no ordinary Jew "of 54 A. D." could possibly have objected either to the number of the miracles or the authority in the name of which they were worked, so long as this authority was "the finger of God" or "the spirit of God" (which means praying to God or invoking in His name) and not some power in enmity to God—Satan or Beelzebub.

This modern tendency, which is a decided anachronism with a Jew "of 54 A. D.", is also prominent

in Meshullam's account of the last days of Jesus. If there is anything certain in the history of Jesus, it is that he avowed himself, first privately and afterwards publicly, to be the Messiah or the Christ of the Jews. His Messianic pattern was given in the rabbinic interpretations of certain passages in the Old Testament as well as in certain apocalyptic writings circulating in his time. This feature in Jesus was always a sore point with the theological *Romanzieri*, not only on account of its being too Jewish, but also of the fact that Jesus' Messianic claims were never made good.

There are only two alternatives to get over the difficulty: either to assume, as some theologians do, that Jesus used the word Messiah in a sense differing from that in which the Jews understood it, meaning by this term the spiritual anointed who will redeem the world from its sins (whatever that may mean), or to deny, with the more advanced school, this Messianic consciousness in Jesus, attributing all his utterances and actions pointing at these Messianic claims to the misconceptions of his first biographers—who were so badly equipped in modern theology.

Meshullam is up-to-date and he seems to be wavering between these two schools (see pp. 180, 210, and 212); but on the whole he is rather inclined to the latter view. He heard with suspicions the self-assertions of Jesus, claiming to be the Way, the Light of the World, the good Shepherd, the Truth and the Life (111), but the "Good Message" seems to have

escaped him, only the people mistaking him for the Messiah (pp. 47 and 116).

It is with this tendency, that Meshullam gives such a prosaic account of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, bringing him up to the Holy City for the mere law-fulfilling purpose of celebrating the Feast of Passover (p. 120). But the inhabitants of Jerusalem, who were on the eve of a rebellion against the Romans, and, as such, in want of a leader (p. 122), hailed him either by confusing him with Jesus bar Abbas, or on account of his own popularity, as their deliverer on the "coming of the Kingdom" (pp. 124-5). The object of all this demonstration, however, remained quite passive. On his face there were no signs of his coming triumph, riding there on his young ass, with his head bent forward, his eyes downcast, and his face all sad (p. 124).

Quite a different story are we told in the New Testament, in the substance of which the Synoptics agree. According to their version, his entry into Jerusalem had a higher purpose, and formed probably the most glorious moment of his life, for which he himself took the initiative in full consciousness of its significance, commanding his disciples to go and fetch a colt for him, so that there might be fulfilled what is written by the prophet: "Behold, behold, *thy king* cometh unto thee, meek and riding on an ass and upon a colt, the foal of an ass" (Zechariah 9.10). Meanwhile the multitude that went before him and that followed cried: "Hosanna to the son of David" (see Matthew 21. 1-11, and parallels). The account is, of course, a little exaggerated, and it

is not impossible that all these multitudes may be reduced to a few adherents of Jesus, who were determined to prepare for their master a Messianic reception.

Indeed, we greatly fear that the face of the haughty rabbi of the first century who stumbled upon some obscure document relating to Jesus' entry into Jerusalem as King, as some theologians fondly call it, bore the same semi-benign, semi-sarcastic smile which might be observed on the face of a pompous English Dean reading the telegrams of the *War Cry*, announcing the triumphal entry of the "General" into New York and the conquest of America. But the smiles of all the rabbis in Palestine and of all the rationalists of to-day could not alter the fact that Jesus *did* believe himself to be the Messiah, that this appearance did form a part of his Messianic programme, and that he accomplished it in his own way.

Jesus' solemn entry into Jerusalem was followed on the day after by his going to the Temple where he performed a "Second Cleansing". As we have seen, there is little basis in fact for the whole story, which probably circulated in two versions, to be converted by Meshullam's ingenuity into two separate events. Meshullam relates that his having been present in the Temple on this cleansing was only due to the chance that on that day he had to offer a sin-offering, and was waiting in the court of the Israelites, while the priests were preparing the midday sacrifice (p. 134). We are afraid that he waited in vain, for, according to the fixed rule, the midday sacrifice concluded the sacrificial service for the day, no of-

fering, whether public or private, being permitted at the altar after the *Tamid.*

On the third day of the week Jesus uttered the *Woes* against the Pharisees. The cause of this irritation seems to have been R. Johanan b. Zaccai, "the president of the Tribunal", who when he passed Jesus saluted him indeed, but the salutation had something of the pride and contempt with which the Masters of the Law regarded all those whom they called country-folk (pp. 144–5). Now it is true that R. Johanan was in the habit of greeting every man first even though he was a heathen. It is also true that his experience of the Galileans was that they hated the Torah, which he indeed resented. But in the year 33 A. D. he must have been still a middle-aged man when, according to the chronological *date*, he was still a disciple, not a master, whilst it is certain that he did not attain the presidentship of the tribunal till after the destruction of the Temple or, perhaps, even as late as 80 A. D. The president of the tribunal or the Nasi at the time of which Meshullam speaks—if there existed such a court besides the Sanhedrin—must have been a descendant of Hillel, Rabban Gamaliel, or Simon of the same family.

In the *Woes* themselves Meshullam agrees with Matthew 23.1-33, but omits (with certain commentators), in verse 10, the words "even the Christ", which would, of course, not be quite in harmony with the theory of Jesus' claims. Unfortunately, there was no Simon ben Lazarus present to protest against these terrible denunciations.

Altogether, these *Woes* are obscure, and the

student of Jewish literature cannot help feeling that the author's or compiler's knowledge of Pharisaic lore must have been very vague. For, as a fact, if a man swore by the Temple or the altar, it was considered as an oath, whilst the simile of the cleansing of the outside of the cup and of the platter shows that the author was incorrectly informed about the matter, for, according to the Halakah, it was the *inside* of the cup which chiefly "received defilement" (*Tum'ah*).

Nor, indeed, was the title of Rabbi, or even Rabban, so common in that early period. Hillel had no title, and so it is doubtful whether even his son possessed it; and when titles had become more fashionable, the rabbis themselves warned their disciples not to study the Torah with the purpose of being called Rabbi or Hakam. As to the general charge of hypocrisy embraced in the *Woes*, we have already heard the admirable rejoinder of Simon ben Lazarus. We shall only add that the Christians did not hold the sole brief for this vague and general charge of hypocrisy. The accusation was mutual. Just as the Christians perceived in the devotion of the Pharisees to the Law only a means to insinuate themselves into the good opinion of the people, so the Jews regarded the Christians' claims to a superior holiness only as an excuse to emancipate themselves from the common duties of life. This "emancipation," the Jews thought, threatened to degenerate into antinomianism and hence they branded them as *Hanefim*, meaning hypocrites.

And again, while the Christians saw in the de-

struction of Jerusalem and the temple a punishment of God befalling the nation for their sins against Jesus, the Jews maintained that it was the sin of heresy, so rampant in Jerusalem during the last period of its existence, which brought upon them those terrible misfortunes. It is not for us to decide who were in the right, but we should think that it is high time that historians should listen to both sides or rule out of court all these mutual recriminations as worthless partisan evidence.

The fourth day after Jesus' arrival in Jerusalem is marked by what Meshullam calls the "Great Refusal," the common people expecting him to be the Christ, the founder of the New Kingdom, "who would not suffer longer the yoke of the Romans to lie upon the neck of Israel" (p. 154), but he "refused to be their liberator" (p. 160). One of the most important features among the occurrences of this fourth day was the Messianic controversy between Jesus and the Pharisees, during which the well-known argument from Matthew 22, 41-46 (and parallels) was advanced, at which argument the Pharisees "knew not what to say, for no man had hitherto used that *stichos* of the Psalm, and they knew not what to reply" (p. 158). Matthew (*ibid.*) tells us a similar story, but Meshullam, a member of the Sanhedrin and a frequent visitor of the Pharisaic schools, ought to have known that his friends were not the men to be brought to silence by such an argument. Why, indeed, should David not call one of his descendants "Lord", if he is the Messiah whose title is (according to Jewish tradition)"Lord", and of whom

the universal belief was that he was to be king of the past and of the future generations?

For us, the whole argument would only prove that this Psalm was interpreted in Jewish schools to refer to the Messiah, and, in fact, there are Messianic allusions enough in the rabbinic literature.[3] There is even reason to suppose that this Psalm formed, in olden times, one of those synagogue lessons which were taken from the Hagiographa and which, as so many others, were interpreted to allude to the Messiah.

The few inaccuracies or misconceptions in Meshullam's account, viewed together with so much that is excellent and true in it, leads us to the conclusion that the learned editor of this memoir intended less to give us the opinions of the real plain *Other* than to present us the *semi-Other* who alone may be looked upon as the connecting link between Judaism and early Christianity. The real *Other* asserts himself not only in the admirable speech of Simon ben Lazarus but also in the fine historical tact which made Meshullam see that the original version of the Parable, narrated in Luke 10.33., must have been "but a certain *Israelite*" (instead of *Samaritan*). This is the only possible opposition to the two sections of the Jews mentioned in that connection: the Priests and the Levites (p. 77). We shall thus have to replace the Good Samaritan of the Parable by the Good Israelite, who is the third estate of Jewish society, as the Priests and Levites were the first and second.

So does the real *Other* assert himself in Meshullam when it seemed to him, from what he heard of Jesus'

teaching, that he had learned much from the Law for the heathen (p. 44). The repulsion which Meshullam felt against the claims of Jesus to be the Truth, the Life, the Light, etc., with regard to which he reminds his friend that we (Jews) see the Deity everywhere, and that we localize him nowhere, is also a healthy sign of a real *Other*, who is not altogether wanting in Meshullam's account. But he is intentionally not allowed to come into full play, Meshullam being meant as a combination of *Other* and something else, thus enabling him to obtain impressions which his colleagues and former fellow-countrymen failed to receive. In the representation of this story of *Other*, our editor has admirably succeeded. As a stroke of genius we consider the incident of Jesus' sudden appearance to Meshullam in his home in Jerusalem, when he spoke to him in a low but piercing voice, these words: "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and the Christ shall shine upon thee" (p. 90), and this, at the same time, when Jesus was seen by others in Gethsemane. Here Meshullam is preparing the way for Paulinism.

The last time when the real *Other* asserts himself—of course, to be modified instantly by the *semi-Other*—is when Meshullam exclaims, at the end of his memoir: "But Israel is greater than any of his sons." There is a world of suggestion in these mighty words. Israel is greater, not only than any of his sons, but than any of the sects and systems which ever went forth from his loins—Essenism, Sadduceeism, Pharisaism, Christianism and Mohammedanism.

Almost all the epithets and metaphors indicative

either of the meekness of Jesus or of his communion with God were originally applied to Israel, from which they were transferred by his pupils to the founder of their sect, and we have no doubt that a thorough study of Jewish literature will lead to the conviction that Jesus was less meant as an incarnation of God than as an incarnation of Israel. Those who are so anxious for the rehabilitation of Jesus in the synagogue had best apply themselves to the rehabilitation of Israel in the synagogue, that is, to obtain a thorough knowledge of Judaism in all its phases of thought and all the stages of its history.

ABRAHAM GEIGER

THIS is an age of anniversaries. Though this century is still in its infancy, it can boast of more "Books of Jubilees" or "Semi-Jubilees" than any other century in its mature age of a full hundred years. Russian Jewry takes the lead, which is only natural, seeing that it is the classical ground of the Zaddikim-cult, hero-worship. Germany and France come next, as may be seen from the number of volumes owing their origin to some festive occasion in the honor of some great man, dead or alive. Even America, which is not particularly given to looking backward, takes delight in honoring, in various ways, the memory of its great religious leaders and spiritual benefactors, native or borrowed from abroad. All of which goes to show that modernity itself, in spite of its self-complacency, and parading as the revelation of the present, somehow feels the need of tracing itself to the past, albeit the nearest past. Even the term tradition, which for so long a time had almost disappeared from our vocabulary, has come into its own and is appealed to in a most solemn manner. We may smile at the claims made for this mushroom tradition, considering that it has neither the sanction of the bulk of the nation nor the weight of almost countless ages; yet there is something gratifying in the appeal to the tradition: it is only another sign that with all our "valor of ignor-

ance" and prattling about the god in ourselves, there is something in our religious conscience which doubts our infallibility and urges for authority and precedent.

The most important of these "Jubilee-Books", published in recent times and relating to Judaism, is the volume, *Abraham Geiger, Leben und Lebenswerk*, which appeared on the occasion of the hundredth birthday of the hero whose name adorns the title-page. Unlike, however, other productions of this kind, where the hero is a mere accident appearing on the title-page and is, as a rule, disposed of with a few complimentary words at the beginning or the end of each contribution, the volume under notice has the hero itself as the subject. Now, Geiger was a great scholar; indeed, one of the greatest that modern Judaism has given us. He was also very productive, so that there are few departments of Jewish science that he has not enriched with his contributions, as may be seen from the excellent bibliography at the end of the volume compiled by Dr. Stern. But he was also an active rabbi, a great preacher, and a most passionate controversialist, figuring as the most prominent leader of the reform movement among the German Jews during the nineteenth century, defending it both in the press and in the pulpit. He was further the editor of two successive periodicals and a contributor to other journals. During the last years of his life he occupied also a chair as professor of divinity in the Berlin *Hochschule*.

Nothing less, therefore, than the combined

efforts of an enthusiastic band of devotees could do justice to a life whose interests were so wide and whose activities were so manifold; and it is the result of this combination that is now offered to us in this volume. It forms a collection of essays contributed by various scholars, each of them endeavoring to give us a faithful picture of that aspect of the master especially appealing to him. Nothing that Geiger did or wrote has escaped them. It will suffice to mention the essay of Dr. Immanuel Löw on "Geiger as a Philologist", accompanied by a list of Hebrew and Aramaic words explained by the latter, to show how minute and close a study some of the contributors to the volume have brought to bear upon this labor of love. This is indeed the right manner to honor our great men and the only way in which the student's need of hero-worship should find expression.

The only fault we have to find is that other contributors in their zeal for their hero did not always observe the Golden Rule laid down by John Stuart Mill for men engaged in this heavenly task. "Hero worship, as Carlyle calls it", Mill writes to a correspondent, "is doubtless a fine thing, but it must be worship not of a hero, but of heroes. Whoever gives himself up to the guidance of *one* man because that one is the best and ablest whom he happens to know, will in nine cases out of ten make himself the slave of that most misleading thing: a clever man's twists and prejudices. One hero and sage is necessary to correct another" (Letters of J. S.Mill, p. 384). And Geiger, great as he was, was certainly not with-

out "twists and prejudices", as well as other frailties and weaknesses to which all flesh is subject.

It should be said at once that this stricture does not apply to the more scientific part of this volume, dealing with *Geiger, der Mann der Wissenschaft.* The contributors to this part were by no means slow to do justice to Geiger, the scholar. They give us full and lengthy appreciations of Geiger's work as Bible *critic*, as historian and philologist, and as *Literarhistoriker*, or *critic.* Particular value is attached to Geiger's achievements in the history of Jewish sects by nearly all the contributors, while Dr. Poznanski assigns to it a special essay. And well he might! No amount of praise can be extravagant when lavished on Geiger's work in that department of Jewish history in which he restores to us many a missing link in the chain of Jewish heresies puzzling his predecessors. One might almost say that he had a genius for heresy-hunting, running them down to their lairs and following their various fortunes through history.

But it is just these heresies which so often act as a stimulus, if not a corrective, to religion in that they preserve it from stagnation and impel it to fresh efforts. Geiger's greatness in this line was particularly shown in his hypothesis regarding the origin of the Sadducees and their historical affinities with contemporary as well as successive sects. It proved one of the most fruitful conjectures advanced by modern scholars.

All this admiration, however, for Geiger's genius—and no serious scholar will ever withhold

it—did not prevent the learned contributors from indicating at least that there are points in Geiger's theories not always tenable in the light of later researches, whilst it is also hinted at that he was not always happy in the working out of his details (see *e. g.* pp. 320, 325, 335, 337, 343, 334, etc). Indeed, it would have been more than a miracle if the continued study of this subject for more than fifty years should not have led to the detection, in the work of the master, of some weak points now in need of correction. I am even inclined to think that the discoveries made within the last decades, much as they may seem at the first glance to support Geiger's hypotheses, will, after a more careful study, call for a revision of Geiger's work, *Die Urschrift*, monumental though it be. For such an eventuality, we are more or less prepared by the contributors to the more scientific part of our volume, suggesting as they do by hints thrown out here and there how little finality was obtainable even by such a scholar as Geiger.

This spirit of discernment which praises but at the same time judges, which does not allow its powers of criticism and discretion to become entirely clouded by the incense which it burns before its idol, is unfortunately absent from the rest of the volume, which may be best described as the controversial part. Practically, it is a party pamphlet. It suffers no rival hero and tolerates no other point of view. It is a sort of manifesto of the present aims and ideals of the party, sanctioned in advance by its only hero.

This part includes also a biographical essay by the son of our hero, Professor Ludwig Geiger. Pro-

fessor Geiger is not exactly a Hebrew scholar nor a Jewish theologian, though he is somewhat known to Jewish students by his contributions to German Jewish history. If we are not mistaken, among his varied activities, he is also at present the editor of a German Jewish paper.[1] But what the professor lacks in Jewish learning is fairly made up by the knowledge of the period, his close acquaintance with the friends and colleagues of his father, and his access to family papers naturally not within the reach of the public. The essay covers more than a third of the volume (pp. 1-204), and bears witness to the filial piety of the writer and to the close intimacy between the rabbi and the professor. It is certainly not only one of the best written but also one of the most complete lives we possess of the great men in Israel, following the career of its subject from the cradle to the grave.

Perhaps it is a little too complete. A great English writer once made the remark: "There is a great discovery still to be made in literature, that of paying literary men by the quantity they do not write". And this is nowhere more true than in the species of literature engaging us at present, where certain undesirable quantities are liable to produce the very opposite effect from that aimed at by the writer. The correspondence of Geiger, especially that with Professor Dérenbourg, published some years ago by the latter,[2] is, as is well known, teeming with such quantities. But we shall confine ourselves to samples in our present volume.

As such we may characterize the letter in which

the rabbi describes to a correspondent the jolly manner in which he spent the Tish'ah be-Ab when on a visit to his brother-in-law, Herr Hamburger. The rabbi, for reasons of his own, did not observe the fast, but was it necessary to put this fact on record for the benefit of posterity? It is certainly not very edifying to see your hero describing with much relish how he enjoyed his meal on the fast-day, behind bolted doors and drawn blinds, whilst his kinsmen and his family *did* refrain from food, a fact which afforded the rabbi much amusement (p.159). Surely, self-denial will always be more admired than self-indulgence, and the real hero of the episode is Hamburger, not Geiger.

More serious are the objections to the presentation the professor gives of the Geiger-Tiktin controversy. It is the Passion-Story of the reform Gospel, with the only difference perhaps that in this case legend has it that it was Caiphas who died of a broken heart whilst the Savior of Modernity came out triumphant from his Via Dolorosa and was happy forever after. To understand our objections better, we shall premise here a few lines from a letter of Geiger to his son.

As it would seem, Geiger the rabbi, in the early youth of the professor, had entertained the hope that his son would one day prove the worthy successor of his father, both as a Hebrew scholar and rabbi. In this he was doomed to disappointment, the son apparently preferring the call of professor in certain secular branches, of which he is now a worthy exponent in the Berlin University, to that of a Jewish

divine. The rabbi felt this disappointment deeply and expressed it in a letter. "Whenever I acquired a book," the rabbi writes, "my thoughts were that it will benefit my Ludwig; or, as often as I had annotated it or penned some remarks, I had in mind that it may prove useful to Ludwig. I should grieve to have cherished a beautiful dream which would have to disappear in the light of reality" (p. 181). But, as it appears from the context of the letter, the future professor entertained serious conscientious scruples against entering upon the rabbinical profession, which presumed the utterance of formulae or terms expressive of a belief in certain doctrines which he did not fully share.

We shall have occasion later on to comment upon the rabbi's endeavor to meet the apparently inflexible scepticism of his son. What we wish to remark in this place is that one who was so fully alive to the difficulties of reconciling the results of *Wissenschaft* even with the office of a reform rabbi in the sixties, should not have been quite insensible to the incongruity of his father serving as Dayyan in a strictly orthodox *Bet-Din* in the forties. Think only of the modernist, or even a budding modernist as Loisy, insisting upon having a seat on the Propaganda Fidei, to assist there in deciding questions of doctrine and practice. We may sympathize with his views, but common sense and common justice would readily agree that his claims were nothing less than preposterous.

The presentation of this Tiktin controversy would have us believe that it was a question of *Wis-*

senschaft and enlightenment, on one hand, and ignorance and fanaticism on the other. (See pp.78, 81, 92, etc). This is certainly not the fact. The opposition to Geiger was not lacking in men of great rabbinical learning and high moral character, though they did not anticipate Wellhausen in his conception of history nor even forestall Geiger in his estimate of rabbinical Judaism; whilst as to fanaticism, anyone who has read the documents relating to the unfortunate controversy will see that the followers of Geiger were as little distinguished by charitableness and forbearance as were the partisans of Tiktin.

The fact is that there were great principles at stake which always were and will ever be at war and for which humanity has never learned to fight and never will, in a chivalrous, calm, and judicial spirit, and which the professor should not have treated so lightly. On the one side, loyalty to tradition and allegiance to authority maintained by Israel at great sacrifice through more than two thousand years; on the other side, the right of private judgment, the palladium of the Protestant Reformation asserted again by David Friedrich Strauss who, the professor assures us, had considerable influence on Geiger (p. 29). This revealed a chasm which no amount of circumlocution such as historical development, continuous tradition, progressive Judaism, and living religion, could bridge over. The one insisted upon his right as a son of the nineteenth century to unsparing criticism of Jewish institutions and the Biblical sources of these institutions (see p. 29), whilst the other, a product of two thousand years of thinking

and suffering, clung to the privilege of living in and dying for the law of his fathers. For indeed it was nothing less than this that the devotion to the Law meant to men of the stamp of Akiba Eger, Solomon Tiktin, and Mordecai Baneth.

To adapt here a passage from Carlyle's *Historical Sketches*:[3] "Descending into these old ages, we are struck most of all with this strange fact, that they were 'Jewish' ages. Actually, men in those times were possessed with the belief that, in addition to their evident greedy appetites, they had immortal souls not a whit less evident; souls which after death would have to appear before the Most High Judge, and give an account of their procedure in the conduct of said appetites with an issue that was endless." And in those Jewish ages, this Most High Judge was not the God who dwelt in you, a God "on improvement" who was holy because you were holy, fashioning himself in accordance with your will and whim; but the Holy One of Israel, a personal and living God, eternal, absolute, and real. And it was further believed that this Holy One of Israel, revealed His holy will through His Holy Torah, to teach Israel ways of holiness, so that they become a holy people, tamed in their appetites, separated from their neighbors, and standing aloof from the vanities and abominations of the world around them, and responsible for every action of theirs, be it ever so unimportant or trifling in their eyes.

These ancestors of ours may not always have lived up to the ideals resulting from such a belief. The "leaven in the dough" and the "servitude to

the kingdoms" may have proved too strong for them too. And this leaven certainly became more fermenting and more powerful at the beginning of the last century. But this was no reason for these poor, old, benighted Jews to make a rush at the sanctuary and lay violent hands upon it. As they conceived it, it was their sins that were responsible for the apostasy of Israel, and it was not the fault of Israel's ancient and sacred heritage. They prayed, they confessed, and grieved, and left the tinkering and the battering away of Judaism to others who believed themselves to be master hands at such performances.

We have already expressed our admiration for Geiger as a scholar, and there is no need of protesting too much. But when the theological contributors describe Geiger as a theologian, and even declare that in a certain sense he has to be looked upon as the founder of the systematic theology of Judaism, we must beg to differ. As with all his contemporaries, Zunz, Frankel, Rapoport, and so many others, his interests centered in philology and history, not in theology.

The list of Geiger's productions, alluded to above, recording so little which may be described as theology, bears out this statement. As to this little, we may note the introductory pages to his series of lectures on *Das Judenthum und seine Geschichte*, which, however, treats largely of the nature of religion in general, in the well-known manner of the old liberal school, Jewish as well as Christian. To that little also belongs *Die Einleitung in das Studium der jüdischen Theologie*, covering the largest

part of the second volume of the *Nachgelassene Schriften*, but of which only a few pages deal with theology proper, if under this term we have to understand the treatment of such topics as God, revelation, righteousness, the kingdom of God, sacrifice and prayer, law, holiness, the origin of evil, sin, reward and punishment, repentance, salvation, and a variety of other similar subjects that form, as a rule, the contents of our standard works on theology.

The only essay of a really theological character by Geiger is perhaps that on original sin (*Erbsünde*) covering about five pages (*Jüdische Zeitschrift* vol. 10, pp. 166-171). Naturally, as a preacher and controversialist, and even more as a prayer-book maker, Geiger often had opportunity of touching on theological subjects. But such accidental remarks and stray statements and frequent vehement attacks on opponents, and unguarded expressions in correspondence with friends, would at the most amount to mere patchwork, which by the very nature of its inherent violence and exaggeration (from which no polemics can ever escape) is bound to be the very opposite of anything approaching to systematic theology.

On the whole, this theology greatly resembles the species of divinity preached by the Broad Church School, with this difference, that the English product, though less cloudy, is more solemn and less given to that cheap abuse of persons and things in which the Germans so often indulge. But what is common to both is the basic principle of re-interpretation which Leslie Stephen somewhere described so drastically as the art of using "the old language in a dif-

ferent sense or to deprive it of sense altogether". Here is an instance taken from the rabbi's correspondence with his son already referred to above. As it would seem, the latter had among the various reasons deterring him from the calling of a Jewish minister also the one that he felt some difficulty in speaking of the Torah as the word of God. The rabbi meets this with the words: "The word of God? Well, indeed, the way in which God speaks, especially in all great deeds of the spirit; and here is certainly one of the greatest deeds of the spirit in the history of humanity" (p. 180). He then proceeds to remark that "in this book legends and myths overgrow the stem as a foliage, that the story of the Creation is a part of this, that also matters having become barren by time as the ceremonies from their origin and even more so in the later troubled times, threatened and still threaten partly to consume the fresh sap. All these facts did not prove detrimental to the vigorous root and the sound stem. We have conquered for us the right to proclaim such views in public" (*ibid.*).

The same thought appears also, at some greater length, in a letter to his friend Dr. Maier, with the additional remark to the effect: The work of regeneration should be taken in hand seriously, a deeper knowledge of history must go hand in hand with executive practical work (p. 217). This is good Broad Church doctrine, and hardly in need of comment, but if we consider it a little more closely, especially the contemptuous reference to myths, legends, and ceremonies, we find that in spite of its solemn tone and poetical metaphor, we have in the passages

nothing more than an unctuous paraphrase of another remark of Geiger's dating from an earlier period. There he declares that the Bible is a complex of the beautiful and the sublime, perhaps the most sublime of all human books, and must cease to be looked upon as divine (pp. 29, 30). This must again be taken in connection with another passage in which the professor assures us that all that exists is only an historical growth and accordingly has no binding power (p. 29). *En passant*, this is cheap sophistry. According to the greatest of our modern savants, the most important of our institutions, such as government, property, family, marriage, and many others, are a mere growth, and may in some cases be traced back in their origin to the most revolting notions of savage humanity. And yet, none (with the exception of a few fanatical anarchists, perhaps) would ever think that this fact relieves him of the duties of the institutions and obligations upon which society is based and which make the sum of our civilization. At any rate these lessons from history are not quite conclusive, and their applications are certainly not of a constructive nature.

To take another point, as with all reformers, the mission doctrine formed a most important feature in Geiger's theology. Indeed he exclaims in one place: "We would have to cease to be Jews were we to believe that our historical mission in the world has reached its end" (p. 262). This sounds very solemn and inspiring. For our part we prefer unconditional Judaism, and consider the following statement of Rabbi Moses Sofer to give evidence of a

much nobler and deeper loyalty to Judaism. This obscurantist and mediaevalist, with all his thorough undivided belief in the advent of the Messiah, to which he clung with every fibre in his heart, declared that "even should our sins bring upon us the punishment which would forever prevent our redemption, this fact would not release us from our allegiance to the Torah." However, we will assume that Geiger's belief in the mission was so strong and absolute, that the conditional way in which he put it was a mere rhetorical flourish.

But we certainly cannot refrain from pointing out that our theological contributors show very little discretion when they declare that Geiger's demand that Judaism become one day the universal and only religion of humanity exceeds even that of the prophets, of the Law-givers, of our philosophers, and of our commentators. They reason that, whilst those ancient and modern authorities (except Geiger) expected the future religion of humanity to become what, for brevity's sake, may be called an "ethical monotheism," Geiger claimed that it will be the Jewish religion which will become the universal religion of the world (p. 260).

Now, the worst devotee of the Zaddikim-cult would have become suspicious at hearing that the creed of his Zaddik was greater and deeper than that of the Law-giver. Nor indeed was Geiger's. For, practically, that Judaism for which Geiger made those sublime claims will have to be first subjected to a reform, stripping it, as our contributors maintain, of all that is temporary and local in it—in other words, of all national

elements. But this, in spite of all pious qualification and solemn circumlocution, means rather a gradual conversion of Judaism to the universal religion, or, as it is sometimes called, the prophetic religion, than a conversion of the world to Judaism. This sufficiently explains the fact that our claims for the Jewish religion, which involve the final abnegation of Israel, have become so much more imperial in our own times than were those of prophets and Law-givers. Even "our own Amos" would have turned from such a theological proposition with abhorrence.

Indeed, the great defect in Geiger's theology is the little room given there to the Israel idea, hardly noticeable as a theological factor. It is true that Geiger speaks of Israel as the people of the Revelation, endowed with a religious genius which made it the proper organ for bringing into contact the human with the divine (p. 252). He even disputed the theory that Israel was for a long time only a henotheistic (in contradistinction to monotheistic) people, of which we read so much in modern theology and which is broached frequently even in Jewish pulpits by the latest disciples of the "master" (see p. 255). Yet, he considered Israel's life as a people (or as a nation) only as the temporary husk, serving to maintain the kernel, continuing to be necessary even in the dispersion, but the destination of Judaism is to become the universal religion or religion of humanity. (See p. 259; see also p. 275.) Hence his resentment against the use of the term "nation" (or *Volk*), whether by Jew or Christian, in connection with Israel (see *Nachgelassene Schriften*, vol. 2, p. 326), whilst he never tired of protesting

against the belief in the advent of the Messiah and the restoration to Palestine, which had to disappear from the prayer-book wherever his authority was recognized.

No Roman procurator of Palestine or Christian bishop of Antioch or Jerusalem could ever have been more hostile than was Geiger to any national aspiration on the part of the Jews, which he at once dubbed as romanticism and reaction. When the famous traveller and philanthropist, Albert Cohn, in an address on his return from a journey to Palestine, expressed the hope of seeing Jerusalem become the seat of culture and happiness, hinting that at least a part of us may find their dwelling in the Holy Land, Geiger could not refrain from protesting against this height of romanticism. He scolded him as well as his colleagues of the Alliance Israélite, who apparently at that time had still some national aspirations, for giving too much attention to the Orient, etc. (*Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vol. 10, p. 217). In the manner of so many modern preachers, Jerusalem became to him a thought (*Gedanke*), or rather a symbol, not a place limited by space (p. 272). But to pray for Palestine and its sacred places, he considered suicide and blasphemy (*Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vol. 7, p. 53.).

Thoroughly scientific as he was, Geiger would, when it was a question of Jewish nationality and restoration, sink to the level of common pulpitasters to whose shallow harrangues one can only apply the well-known saying of Maimonides: "Every preachment is but babbling." It is enough

to refer here to the strange, amusingly ungrammatical interpretation of Isaiah, 2.3, of which he says: "For us it may mean: For out of Zion *came* forth the Law, instead of 'shall go forth' " (*Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vol. 6, p. 18).

In another place he polemizes against the romanticism of the "Holy" Land (the quotation marks are Geiger's), and endeavors to prove that as often as a healthy spirit breathed through Israel the Land of Promise was considered as something unimportant and inconsequential. He appeals in all seriousness among others, to Jeremiah and to the statement of Rab Judah (Ketubot 110b) that he who emigrates from Babylon to Palestine transgresses a prohibitive command (*Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vol. 3, pp. 146 and 147). This statement is, of course, against the opinion of all the predecessors, contemporaries and successors of Rab Judah, and was ignored by his own pupils. Probably there were some personal reasons, now unknown to us, for this strange isolated dictum. However, one thing is certain, that, in spite of these reasons, there is not the slightest doubt that Rab Judah would equally with his contemporaries have objected to all attempts at purging the liturgy in the modern manner, and would have stigmatized them as crass sectarianism.

But whilst Geiger recognizes in Rab Judah of Babylon a forerunner of modern tendencies, he perceives in the longing for Palestine of Rabbi Judah ha-Levi of Spain, which found expression in his famous poem "Zion", and other poetical pieces, something morbid and diseased, which made him appear to his con-

temporaries as fantastic and eccentric (*Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vol. 3, p.148). That Rabbi Judah ha-Levi's poem had found so many imitations of which the liturgy is full, need hardly be told. But we may remark here that it is now certain that Jerusalem was a gathering-point even in post-talmudic times, and during the Tabernacle Feast harbored pilgrims from all parts, even outside of Palestine, who came there and had great celebrations on the Mount of Olives. These pilgrimages ceased only with the Crusades, to which was due, of course, the fact that Nahmanides and Judah ha-Levi were heard so little of after their reaching the Holy Land.

Of course, all this antagonism was a consequence of his universalistic tendencies, for which Judaism had to bring all sacrifices. The craving for emancipation had also its share in it. The great thing was not to offend one's fellow-citizens. The consciousness of forming a part of the new fatherland demanded the abandoning of the doctrine of the advent of the Messiah. Only fools and eccentrics, according to him, still cling to this belief (*Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vol. 7, p. 12). The doctrine of the election of Israel, to which he did not entirely object, had also to be qualified and modified, at least was not to be so often emphasized as others thought. His pitiful efforts towards a compromise between utterance and silence strongly remind us of the reduced gentlewoman who, compelled by poverty to cry fresh eggs through the streets, added after every call: "I hope nobody hears me." Such formulae in the prayer-book as emphasized the separation of Israel must also disappear lest we give

offence to our neighbors. (See *ibid.* pp. 55 and 56. See also *Abraham Geiger*, p. 264). The Hebrew language, which, as he expressed it, was during the time of our national imagining (*nationalen Phantasielebens*) a sort of home, must also be reduced to a minimum in our generation, in which our culture, our intellectual life, and our social activities root in the vernacular. And he exclaims: "History has given her judgment (against the Hebrew language), even though this judgment is not yet carried out, and all lamentations against this condition of things are useless. No protest is justified against the forces of history" (*Jüdische Zeitschrift*, vol. 7, p. 7).

Perhaps we may remark that if our ancestors had thought in the same manner in the time after the destruction of the Temple, or in the age of Constantine, when Christianity became the dominant religion, or in the ages of the Crusades, or later on during the persecution of the Black Death, or in the age of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, when it seemed as if the whole universe arrayed itself against the religion of Israel, Judaism would have long ago disappeared. To all appearances, the judgment of history was certainly against us. The really great Jew was that exile from Spain who knew how to spite history, and who, in the most despairing moments of his life, his wife and children having starved to death, and he himself in a fainting condition from starvation, exclaimed: "In spite of all powers of heaven and earth a Jew I am, and a Jew I shall remain". In the same category of the doomed fall also circumcision, which is a mere barbaric relic, as well the dietary laws, which

ceremonies are only an obstacle in the way of the realization of the great ideal of the brotherhood of humanity. (See *Nachgelassene Schriften*, vol. 5, pp. 181, 182, and 183).

This hostile attitude towards ceremonies and symbols, as well as towards the Jew in general, as far as they served to preserve Israel as a distinct people, affected not only his theology but also his conception of Jewish history. I am especially referring to the heading in his Introduction to the Study of Jewish Theology alluded to above: "Stubborn (or Inflexible) Legalism, Extending from the Sixth to the Middle of the Eighteenth Century". (*Nachgelassene Schriften*, vol. 2, p. 129; see also p. 64.) Such a heading would certainly be more in place in an Introduction to the New Testament, with the only difference perhaps that the Christian divine would extend these periods of stubborn legalism on both sides. But no Jewish theologian who speaks of continuity and unity could ever admit such a blank covering nearly fifteen hundred years in Jewish thought. Nor is there, indeed, much unity and continuity in Geiger's conception of Jewish history, in spite of the smooth reading that his lectures on *Das Judenthum und seine Geschichte* offer to the reader.

Bishop Stubbs, the famous historian of the English constitution, once remarked that no dissenter could ever write a good English history, as, with the dissenters, the English people only begin with Cromwell. The same may be remarked of Geiger and his school, with whom Jewish history

breaks up somewhere in antiquity, to begin again with Mendelssohn, who prepared the way for that "New Theology" which dawned upon Israel in the thirties. (*Nachgelassene Schriften*, vol.2, p. 26.) The general impression received from Geiger's writings, historical as well as theological, is that to the author the whole history of Judaism for more than a thousand years was nothing less than a wide, hopeless morass, full of legal miasma, and teeming with obnoxious, mystic, superstitious creatures, only offering now and then a few stepping-stones, such as a grammarian, a few commentators, a few poets, and a few philosophers and sectarians, contesting tradition, bridging over the chasm from hopeless Rabbinism to the promised land of modernity.

For the great inarticulate ones, both in the East and in the West, their suffering, their boundless love for God and Israel, their loyalty to the Torah, their readiness to sacrifice, their continuous martyrdom, their simple lives and their simple manners, their unassuming and spontaneous piety and deeply affectionate nature that found expression in their devotional literature, their incessant cry after God, as voiced by their ungrammatical but deeply spiritual Piyyutim, their wills, their rules of conduct, Geiger had very little understanding or interest, except, perhaps, insofar as they occasionally may have had "lucid moments", and made some remark or other to be quoted with advantage at some Synod. For this we must go to Zunz, who was at least as liberal in his opinions as Geiger, perhaps even more liberal, as he did not belong even to the Broad Church. No party

can claim him. If he belonged anywhere, it was to Israel, which he did understand and love.

It is the central position of Israel in Jewish history and Jewish thought, its existence, its maintenance, and its duration, which make the great difference between Zunz, on the one side, and Geiger and his school, on the other. Zunz never apologized for the existence of Israel. According to him, the separateness of Israel, forming an entity, both as a nationality and as a religion, are facts recognized by history, and there is no need of apologizing for them. Israel was accordingly justified in looking back to its great achievements—spiritual and material—in the past and to cherish its hopes for a glorious future: to live its own life, to think its own thoughts and zealously to guard its identity both as a nationality and a religion through the means of symbols and ceremonies and a sacred language of its own, and even to possess a code of etiquette and manners of its own, all calculated to perpetuate its existence.

Geiger, on the other hand, saw in Israel a religious corporation, a sort of non-celibate monks, whose *raison d'être* was not in themselves, but outside of them, *viz.* to teach the world certain dogmas and creeds, and whose existence was only justified in proportion to their success as teachers. The religious teaching of Israel has therefore more value for Geiger than the religious life of Israel, not to speak of its peculiar civilization (*Kultur*), so far as it developed on lines of its own, to which civilization they had hardly a right. And even its religious teaching has always

to be guarded against an over-emphasis of such aspects as can only result in isolating Israel, and in bringing about a divorce between the teachers and pupil. In other words, the national elements have to be eliminated, even though they may be at the basis of Israel's religious teachings.

This difference between the two leaders became especially marked when Zunz published his *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*, a great part of which is devoted to Israel's *Kulturgeschichte*, and against which Geiger wrote his famous review in the *Israelit des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*. It is a very long review of a depreciatory nature, both of the subjects and the persons treated there, showing no sympathy even with the topic "Teachers of Ethics" (*Sittenlehrer*). Of course, those teachers were simple Jews who neither understood nor misunderstood Aristotle or Plato. They were not even free from the superstitions of their time. They were plain Jews, good, saintly souls, truthful and affectionate, and thus of no account as a theological asset in the universal religion to come. But, as Zunz said, "he who as Jew passes them over with contemptuous superiority is not called upon to write history; he who despises himself in his people is not the man to record their deeds".

However, it is not the purpose of this review to pass judgment upon the theological opinions of Geiger. The "twists and prejudices" of this great man can easily be explained on the ground that Geiger belonged to a generation which, feeling still the tremor of the great spiritual and intellectual upheaval of the

French Revolution, never emancipated itself entirely from the rationalistic views prevalent at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Not unlike the first Christians, they hoped for and believed in the speedy disappearance of the Old World to be replaced by a new heaven and a new earth, in which rationalism will reign supreme. The Jews especially saw in the few crumbs of emancipation granted to them the redemption which was to include the whole of humanity. The great day had already dawned upon humanity, with the Messianic age looming in the not very far distance.

The great mission of the Jewish leaders was, then, to prepare Israel for the blessed time already visible on the horizon. Israel had, accordingly, to be humanized or, as the phrase was, turned over to the *Menschheit*, lest our sins of particularism and separateness delay the advent. True, there was such a thing as history, which the rationalists of the nineteenth century did not ignore,—nay, to which they were constantly appealing. But its function was not that of the reactionary sort, to show the glories of the past, the importance of institutions, the impossibility of long gaps and the danger involved in violent breaks —this was mere romanticism. History was only valuable as a study of the sources and of the crooked ways and the frequency of stagnation of tradition diverting it from its straight course of reason, leading to the great sea of humanity, in which Judaism should lose itself in the end. That history means remembrance, and that remembrance results in hope, which is the very reverse of absorption, was not foreseen

by the few historians the Reform Movement gave us. This could only have been divined by men like Krochmal and Zunz, who were ahead of their time; whilst Geiger was strictly a product of his time. He indulged in its dreams, he cherished its hopes, and it is not for us of another generation to judge him. For us it is to remember only his scholarship, not his theology.

But we cannot refrain from expressing our astonishment that the theological contributors present us this theology as something final, without making the least attempt to qualify its "twists and prejudices" by views and opinions of other great heroes of Israel. They ought to have been aware that, whatever merits rationalism may have possessed in certain respects, it was, as is admitted now even by radical writers, wholly deficient in the understanding of the thing holiness. Rationalism could well appreciate all the virtues of manliness, but it could never properly value those qualities of obedience, submission, meekness and self-denial which constitute a holy life.

The sentiments, both of grief and of joy, which make the real life of the religionist, were largely unintelligible to the great majority of our rationalists inaugurating the Reform Movement. They could not understand that holy dependence on God which enables the Psalmist to exclaim: "I was cast upon Thee from the womb: Thou art God from my mother's belly,"—that joy in the word of God which makes the prophet say: "Thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart: for I am called by Thy name, Lord, God of hosts",—that childlike submission which

the Psalmist felt when he said: "Surely I have stilled and quieted my soul as a child that is weaned of his mother,—my soul is even as a weaned child;"—that absolute feeling of loneliness and abandonment which finds expression in such scriptural verses as: "Is His mercy clean gone forever? Doth His promise fail evermore? Hath God forgotten to be gracious? Hath He in anger shut up His tender mercies?",—that consciousness of sin that leads the prophet to declare: "Behold, the Lord's hand is not shortened that it cannot save —but your iniquities have separated you from your God",—that exaltation, again, which the religionist experiences even when he only repeats the word of the Psalmist: "Whom have I in heaven but Thee? There is none on earth I desire besides Thee."

This deficiency could have been well supplied if our contributors could have agreed to learn also something from their very antagonists Rabbi Akiba Eger, Rabbi Mordecai Baneth, Rabbi Moses Sofer, and even the Polish Zaddikim, who, as it would seem, were the only ones who experienced the secret of holiness and lived holiness. When one of our theological contributors, perceiving in Geiger the man who prepared the way for prophetic Judaism (p. 296), exclaims somewhere in his defence of his hero against the reproach of inconsiderate radicalism: "The prophets were no diplomats, nor was Geiger" (p. 301), he certainly showed a great want of humor so peculiar to the latter-day prophets of this generation.

Does our theologian really mean to say that the men we have just mentioned, or the other opponents of

Geiger, were of the kind of the false prophets which the prophets of yore attacked? Is it really one of the deadly sins to observe the dietary laws or to keep the Sabbath in the way prescribed by Orthodox Judaism? Is it really this adherence to Orthodoxy which prevents the moral regeneration of our or any other age? Was there none among the old Jews, even Shulhan 'Aruk Jews, who ever felt a thrill when reading, for instance, the fifteenth or the twenty-fifth Psalm? Was morality, indeed, a monopoly of Peter Beer, Holdheim, and Stern? Was it really, as in the case of the Protestant Reformation, the scandalous and immoral life of the Orthodox rabbis which led to the inauguration of our modern Jewish Protestantism?

Has our contributor ever read the lives of Rabbi Elijah Wilna, or of Raphael Cohen of Hamburg, and realized what pure and holy lives they led? Naturally our contributor will say that his hero fought for the truth, but so did his opponents, fighting for what they considered the truth, though it was not the truth "of the plausible kind." To mention only one case, I will repeat here the words of one of these obscure Rabbis, Nathan of Braslav, who, in a letter to his son about a certain religious controversy in which he was involved, writes: "And even, God forbid, if I should have to lose my *Olam ha-Ba* (Salvation), the truth is the truth, and I have no desire and longing but for the veritable truth."

And what must be specially noticed is that poor Nathan *did* believe in *Olam ha-Ba*, and the loss of it meant to him eternal torture. It is remarkable that with all our talk of tolerance and mutual good will

we have never learned that appreciation of "objective piety" which is such a delightful feature in real modern liberalism, enabling a Renan to admire St. Francis of Assisi, and a Leslie Stephen to understand such a soul as Cardinal Newman. Our Jewish liberals are just where they were fifty years ago.

Not less of an anachronism is the attitude of our theological contributors towards the national aspect in Judaism. As already indicated above, it was the belief in the political and social millennium, as well as the hopes held out by the partial emancipation which was breaking upon them, which led to the over-emphasis of the universalistic element in Judaism on the part of Geiger. This was not only the case with Geiger, but with all his fellow-reformers, as may easily be seen by any man who still has the patience to read those hopeful effusions in the "Protocols", for instance, of the second *Rabbiner Versammlung*, in Frankfurt-on-the-Main, 1846. It is rather amusing to see the amount of cheap learning and superficial theology displayed in that synod. The majority seem to agree upon the importance of the Messianic belief which the speaker declares to be the central idea of Judaism (pp. 78 and 82). But then comes the interpretation, which most speakers define as impersonal, consisting in the reconciliation of humanity with Israel's true religion (p. 83); or in the kingdom of the fear of God, of peace, of love, of truth and of justice (p. 97); or in the unity or regeneration of all humanity in faith and love through Israel; or in the redemption or emancipation from spiritual evil in the establishment of God's Kingdom on earth (p. 76).

But, of course, Israel's true religion is that taught by the Synod, or rather by that section of German Israel which sent delegates to that Synod. For, indeed, it is German Jewry in which, according to one speaker, the belief in a personal or political Messiah has died out. I hardly need say that the words "German Jewry" (*Deutsche Judenheit*) have to be modified in the sense of a fraction of German Jewry. For there were, even at that time, a large number of German Jews who protested against such an interpretation of the Messianic belief. Probably it was this fraction of true believers which another speaker had in mind when he exclaimed with regard to the traditional belief that the Messiah will be a descendant of the house of David: "Who is the real house of David? We, the remnant of Israel. It is the Jews as such remnant to whom all the promises (to David) relate" (p. 85).

This is rather comical. It is, however explainable and even pardonable in view of the glorious visions finding expression in such statements as the following: "We perceive the kingdom of heaven on earth constantly approaching through the endeavor of humanity" (p. 84), or, "We are already entering into the redemption; liberty and virtue have increased; everything becomes better" (p. 85); or, "The Jewish teaching about the Messiah is approaching its realization in vigorous steps (*mit starken Schritten*)" (p. 79).

But this, I say, may have been pardonable enough fifty years ago. But, cannot our theological contributors see that their spiritual grand-

sires have lived under a delusion, that none of their hopes were fulfilled, that the kingdom of God on earth, if it was ever approaching, is further than ever from our horizon, through the brutal nationalism which is now the dominant passion of mankind. Can they not see that new problems have arisen, such as capital and labor, the worship of brutal force, and the manifest destiny of weaker races to perish, the solution of which problems is so terribly complicated and becoming more imperative every day? And whatever the solution will be, there is all reason to fear that it will be anti-Messianic in its character.

And least of all were all these Messianic prospects and hopes fulfilled with regard to Israel. The older generation, in the *naïveté* of its first thought, imagined that it would settle all difficulties when it created for itself a new trinity. The parole of the age became, and still is, blood and iron, and those who were still swayed by humane compassion and motives of human brotherhood are considered entirely as adhering to an obsolete conception of the universe. This Nationalism has devoured humanity, but it is just as much encroaching upon religion, and even more upon Judaism, as the anti-Semitic agitations of the last two generations have proved. It tolerated no sharing in its devotion. It demands the whole man and the abandonment of all past and future. This was our experience even in more civilized countries, not to speak of the eastern parts of Europe, where Israel had practically to undergo the same suffering, the same degradation and humiliation as it did in the darkest Middle Ages.

Now as to Jewish Nationalism, it is not a creation of the nineteenth century. Its compact with religion was eternal. If in the Maccabean times the nation arose in arms to defend its religion, the reverse happened after the destruction of the holy Temple, and the successive spread of Christianity, when religion took the Jewish nation under its protection and consecrated it forever. We would have been spared all the terrible persecutions if we could ever have agreed to eliminate from it the national features and become a mere religious sect. To this all our literature and history testify.

It was just those things which distinguished us from our surroundings (not for the things which we had in common with them) and separated us from the nations, such as the devotion to the Pentateuch, the keeping of the Sabbath, the observance of the Covenant of Abraham, and the loyalty to the dietary law, to which we clung for thousands of years with all our life and for which we brought numberless sacrifices. Is this now the time, when the thought of nationalism is universally accepted, to destroy it as far as Israel is concerned? Should we not rather cherish it as the best antidote against the poison of utter assimilation which threatens us now as never before? Are our contributors blind to the fact that such statements as the original "seasoned" Reformers were in the habit of making: "We Jews do not want to form a nation. We are Germans or Englishmen or Frenchmen of the Jewish persuasion", are now out of date? At least, they should realize that there is an Israel outside of Germany and that even in Germany there

are hundreds and thousands who openly and distinctly declare their allegiance to the Jewish nation. They may have some difficulty in reconciling it with their allegiance to the German nation, if consistent in their thought, but certainly no greater difficulty than those who insist upon harmonizing it with their devotion to humanity at large.

We ought to be by now so far as to see that consistency in these matters is neither a virtue nor a mark of special intelligence. Furthermore if there is anything which history taught us during the decades, it is the fallacy of the notion of the mission by which our first Reformers endeavored to compensate us for our betrayal of the Jewish nation and disloyalty to the Law. We have now good Christians and bad Christians and lax Christians. We have *Freidenker*, spiritualists, Christian Scientists, and any number of new sects and fads, but certainly our numbers have by no means increased through accretions from outside. The world has not shown the least sign that it is prepared to be converted to Judaism, except the few proselytes we got through intermarriage. But certainly all statistics point to the fact that we have lost, during the last century, more men and women to Christianity than in any age especially distinguished by persecution. Besides, do we really believe that this bourgeois religion of ours which is entirely deficient in all enthusiasm and whose great virtue is adaptability, a religion which does not oppose itself to any thing in particular, is calculated to convert the world? Frankly speaking, can this religion

of ours train men of the stamp of an Eliot, of a Livingston, and of hundreds and thousands of others who left civilization and lived for years under the greatest privations and dangers in their zeal to convert the pagans of Africa, America, and Asia? We may not agree with their aims, but we must admire their sacrifice, their martyrdom, their courage, and their enthusiasm.

Perhaps there may be also such a thing as a passive mission. Our Christian neighbors would certainly admire us if they would see us, for instance, closing our business on the Sabbath, at the risk of our material prosperity, or attending frequently our places of worship, thus involving inconvenience, or observing other laws which do not go well with comfort. The world will always respect self-denial, even in a material age. But we certainly will not impress the world and convert either Christian or pagan by discovering that the substance of Judaism is about the same as Harnack discovered to be the substance of Christianity. After all these experiences and facts, it is time that we cease to worship one school and that we correct their errors by the dictum of another hero, the great Zunz, who declared that the denial of the advent of the Messiah is among the things which mean the abandonment of the past and the future of Judaism, adding that suicide is not a reform.

Another fact which is to be taken into consideration and which ought to have put our theological contributors on their guard, is the following (I am referring to the Christian Movement which is now

so conspicuous in our ranks): Whatever the views of Geiger and his contemporaries may have been as to the binding power of the Scriptures and the authority of traditional Judaism, there is one point where they allowed no compromise nor concession. This point was the claims of Christianity or of its founder to recognition on the part of Israel. Indeed, Geiger was the man who fought it most consistently, and left us literature that may even to-day be used with advantage. He always was in arms against its claims of superiority or even equality with Judaism, whilst he would never allow these claims any encroachment upon the pulpit or the liturgy. He even strove for the historical Sabbath, less on account of its being the traditional day of rest and sanctification, than because every attempt to substitute Sunday for it might be regarded as a concession to Christianity.

But times have changed and there is now a regular movement among us which preaches Christianity of a more or less dogmatic form. Some Puritan divine, who was *favorably* inclined towards the Jews, once made the remark that the difference between the Jews and the Christians is that, while the Jews expect the Christ (Messiah) to come to them, the Christians believe that the Jews will come to Christ.

And this is what certainly happens in our day. In this country, as well as in England and in Germany and even in Russia, there are men of social and cultural standing who not only invite us to recognize the value of certain ethical teachings in the New Testament (for which a Geiger and

other Jewish students could have easily found parallels both in the Old Testament and in the rabbinical literature), but also expect us to pay homage to the personality of its founder and his superior worth, which makes him, if not a God, at least one of the great prophets of Israel and of humanity. We are expected to revise the judgment which all our history, through thousands of years, has given upon him, and to join at least the left wing of Christianity in the tribute paid to the "sweet Rabbi of Nazareth." This expression is now a common one on certain pulpits and Jewish platforms, on which Christ has become a subject for sermons and orations as in any Unitarian Church.

This means, indeed, the beginning of the end, if not strongly opposed by those responsible for the perpetuation of Judaism. We have been playing with fire till now. We attacked the law. We joined in the opposition towards the Pentateuch. We have preached prophetic Judaism in contradistinction to traditional Judaism. We always spoke of the superiority of universal religion to national religion. We rejected all claims of Judaism for perpetuation and eternity, and the results are, as just indicated, that we are coming to Christ. Is it not time, in view of all these facts, that we revise our theology and even learn something from S. R. Hirsch about the importance of the Men of Israel, or even from the Zionists about the necessity of perpetuating the Jewish nation, if Judaism is at all to survive the crisis? In other words, is it not time that the new theology should consist in the best that all the men of Israel,

including Geiger, gave us, but should modify and qualify his views, dating from a rationalistic age, by the loyalty to the law of Rabbi Akiba Eger and Rabbi Mordecai Baneth, by the deep insight into Jewish History of a Zunz and a Krochmal, by the mysticism of a Ba'al Shem and some of his best followers, and by the love for Israel's nationality and its perpetuation of Herzl or Ahad Ha-'Am?

LEOPOLD ZUNZ

Professor Kaufmann, who enjoyed the privilege of being a personal friend of Zunz, tells us that Zunz once made the remark to him: "Those who have read my books are far from knowing me". If so, we who cannot boast of such privileges, have hardly a right to speak of Zunz's views, his efforts, or his aims. But, on the other hand, we are inclined to think that those thoughts which a great man considers it right to refrain from confiding to the public concern the public very little. Indiscreet publications have seldom proved to be of great literary value. They usually gratify our curiosity more than they enrich our knowledge of the author who is thus betrayed. There is no need of extorting anything from genius. It gives us its best, spontaneously and liberally. Zunz, too, has set down his best and noblest thoughts in his works. By the aid of these we shall try to give some idea of what he was and what his works meant for the science of Judaism.

Yomtob Lipmann (or Leopold) Zunz was born on August tenth, 1794. His birthplace was Detmold, the capital of the principality of Lippe in Germany. Scarcely anything is known about his parents except that the name of his father was Menahem. According to one account, Zunz received his first instruction in Hebrew from his father. But this instruction could not have amounted to much.

For in the year 1803 Zunz's father was already dead, and the young orphan was placed at the school (or rather orphan asylum) in Wolfenbüttel which was founded there, in 1786, for the children of the poor, by the philanthropic Samson family.

The institution still exists, and is known under the name of "*Die Samson'sche Freischule*". At the time, however, of which we speak, the institution had very little of the character of a school in the modern sense. Though it pleased people to call it a *Bet ha-Midrash*, it was the ordinary *Heder* with all its faults. It had no regular school hours, no holidays, and the pupils went through no bodily exercises. Every secular study was strictly excluded from the educational programme, the entire instruction being confined to the Talmud and certain portions of the Bible, especially the Pentateuch.

But even the grammar of the language in which the Bible is written was not taught in this school. Zunz studied it by himself together with his school-fellow Jost "to the annoyance of their teachers". These latter had indeed every reason to resent the liberty taken by "these boys" who wanted to grow wiser than their masters. For Zunz soon acquired knowledge enough of the Hebrew language to display his sarcastic wit, for which he was remarkable in his tenderest youth, in a biting satire directed against his narrow-minded teachers. When the *corpus delicti* was discovered, Zunz was denounced as the "impertinent one", and the *opus* was given to the flames. Jewish history was also an unknown field in this institution. The only book relating to this branch of Jewish science

which Zunz and Jost knew at this time of their life was the Josippon (Pseudo-Josephus) which by some miracle found its way into the *Bet ha-Midrash* and was read by the boys with great delight, which, however, was probably not shared by their teachers.

So the matter went on till 1807. Notwithstanding all these disadvantages we must not believe that these years (1803-1807) were quite lost for Zunz. It was probably during this time that he laid the foundation of a thorough knowledge of the Talmud which proved so useful for his later studies. This strange world—called Talmud—with its strange language, its strange diction, its strange discussions, and its strange mode of thinking will never open istelf in all its fulness and richness except to a mind whose freshness has not as yet been dimmed by impressions made on it by other subjects. We must not therefore lament too deeply the one-sidedness to which the boy was condemned for a few years. To acquire thoroughness in the Talmud one must be subject to one-sidedness for a certain period in one's life.

A wider horizon opened before Zunz's eyes in 1807, when the *Heder* or *Bet ha-Midrash* was converted into a regular school and put under the able direction of Samuel Meyer Ehrenberg. Under the guidance of this highly cultured and genial teacher, whom his pupils kept in loving memory through all their lives, Zunz remained for about two years. Ehrenberg belonged to the school of the *Meassefim* (contributors to a Hebrew periodical called *Meassef*), whose chief efforts were directed toward regenerating the Hebrew tongue, besides acquiring an elementary knowledge

in various branches of secular learning. It was thus probably under his influence that Zunz, as well as Jost, acquired both the taste and the ability for writing an elegant and correct Hebrew style.[1]

In the year 1809 Zunz entered the *Gymnasium* in Wolfenbüttel, where he remained until 1815. He was the first Jew of this place who attended a Christian college. At the same time he was also active as a teacher in the school in which he had formerly been a pupil. He left Wolfenbüttel for the university in Berlin, where he studied philosophy and philology up to 1819.[2] He concluded his university career by writing a dissertation on Shemtob Palquera, for which he received his Doctor diploma from the University of Halle in January, 1821. It was renewed (on the occasion of his Doctor-Jubilee) in 1871.[3]

We have now arrived at a period in which Zunz's scientific researches had already begun. We shall pause awhile to take a survey of the state of the literature which formed the subject of these researches.

Eduard Gans, the president of the famous *Verein für Cultur und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, expresses himself in the preface to the *Statuten* of this society about the state of Jewish science in words to the following effect: The efforts of the Jews in religion, history, and philosophy have never been treated in an independent and liberal spirit. Ignorant and prejudiced rabbis, looking upon Jewish literature as having no relation to other products of the human mind, were at once unable and unwilling to prepare the way for a Jewish science. What there is of good and able work we owe to Christian scholars.[4] This

sweeping assertion is certainly unjust, and proves Gans's lack of sympathy with everything coming from Jews.

The critical work *Meor 'Enayim* by Azariah de Rossi would have been sufficient to spare Jewish authors from such a condemnatory judgment. Nor is Gans's praise of Christian authors just. If they show more ability for systematizing existing material than the Jews, they are usually less familiar with its contents than the latter, and therefore less trustworthy in their conclusions. To be sure, no one will deny that Wolf, Bartolocci, and other Christian scholars did good service to the scientific treatment of Judaism. But this does not deprive Zacuto, Heilprin, Azulai, and others of their merits. The fact is that both Jews and Christians have done their best—as far as the means and notions of their times made it possible for them—to prepare the way for a science of Jewish literature. But it is also true that this science did not as yet exist, and had still to be created.

The problem which a Jewish science, as conceived by Zunz and his friends, had to solve was twofold:

1. To master all the material scattered in Jewish works, to sift it, to arrange it according to its historical development, and thus, after having found out the "chief currents" of Jewish thought permeating all these seemingly disconnected channels, to unite them into one organic whole.

2. To prove the relation of this organic whole to the still larger whole, the literature of the world, to define its position in it, and to show the mutual influences of these two organisms.[5]

The design—as we see—was ambitious and grand enough. But though all the members of the *Verein* perceived it, the arduous task of carrying it out was left to Zunz alone. His friends either lacked sympathy with the subject, as was the case with Gans, or wanted the ability required for such a work, as was the case with Bendavid and other members of the *Verein*. Heine's unfavorable judgment of Bendavid's essay: "What he (Bendavid) writes is both out of date and out of place, his articles being more suitable for the *Theologische Journal* anno 1786",[6] may be applied without much modification to all the contributions of the *Zeitschrift* by the members of the *Verein*, except those written by Zunz.

Indeed, Jewish records hardly know an age in which such an undertaking as Zunz's would have looked more desperate than the time in which his epoch-making essay on Rashi appeared. If the old Jews of the Middle Ages knew nothing of history and development, they still found in Jewish literature "grandeur and horizon", making it to them the subject of their admiration and devotion. They took, in their literal sense, the words of the rabbis "that everything which will be discovered by the able Jewish students was already known and taught to Moses on Mount Sinai," and also heartily believed the assertion. Thus every product of Jewish genius was to them a manifestation of the same divine spirit to which the Scriptures themselves owed their origin. If it happened that certain writings, the orthodoxy of which was suspected (as for instance, the philosophical works of Maimonides and R. Levi ben Gershon), were for a time considered

anything but divine, they had only to live a few generations longer, and the piety felt before the past and the reverence for everything written in the holy language restored their divine character.

With the rationalistic age of Mendelssohn such beliefs were no longer tenable. The authority of the rabbis themselves was questioned, and the recommendations by their successors were of still less avail. Rationalism, however, without a scientific basis can only destroy, but it is powerless to create or to construct; it can open the eyes of men to perceive the darkness which envelops them, but it does not illuminate the darkness nor lift the cloud to help them to the right way. "Yet from those flames no light but rather darkness visible."

Thus we find the German Jews at the beginning of this century in that helpless transitory condition which only a man of the pure character and deeply religious mind of a Zunz could possibly survive. The old glorious Yeshibot (talmudical colleges), in which Jewish learning had found a home for many centuries, were gone, but the seminaries had still to be founded. The old venerable rabbis who were at the head of those colleges were considered as an antiquated survival of an obscure time fit only for "praying" psalms for the salvation of departed souls; whilst the new Jewish professor with his rabbinical learning and scientific training had still to be born. When Zunz and his friends spoke of the necessity of founding schools, seminaries, and academies, the general body of Jews remained entirely indifferent to their appeal. Left without assistance from the

public, the *Verein* was necessarily soon dissolved. Its president, Gans, and other members went over to Christianity, whilst those who remained Jews lamented bitterly the want of all idealism among their coreligionists without which Judaism was not worth suffering for.

It was, however, neither the disappearance of the old ideals nor impatience at the slow development of the new ones that exasperated so many noble minds among the Jews of this period. It was the tyranny of the interregnum that moved them to wrath. Whatever aberrations the history of Judaism may show, one cannot deny that they were only the consequence of exaggerating an idea or of carrying it too far. Thus in certain ages the idea of authority was so strong that it led very often to the surrender by the individual of independent thinking. In others, again, the philosophic tendency was so prevalent that it finally degenerated into a superficial rationalism which seems quite childish to us. In ages of mysticism the theory of immanence was carried by some people so far as to confuse the Creator with His creations, cause with effect.

But even these regrettable aberrations are not devoid of redeeming elements, for they show the supremacy of the idea and its sway over the mind of Jews, a sway so absolute that they could not resist following it even when its directions became dangerous. This devotion to ideas extended itself to the bearers of the ideas. They formed a kind of learned aristocracy among the Jews, and the synagogue stood entirely under their influence. And it

was the Talmudist, the philosopher, or the mystic—according to the different tendencies in the various ages—who exercised a kind of ideal government among his brethren.

In the later age, however, of which we speak here, both the old ideas and their initiators had become, as already observed, entirely obsolete. But before the new conceptions could ripen or the old ones be revived, no other standard remained by which to gauge the importance of a man in Jewish society and the weight of his opinions but his wealth. The authority of the synagogue also soon passed from the hands of its spiritual heads into that of the men of wealth, or the lay heads of the Jewish communities, as the phrase went. It was this lay head—with his "arrogance in the synagogue", his preposterous tone at the meetings, his arbitrariness in appointing the "officials", his impertinent treatment of these officials, his want of sympathy with Jewish scholarship and Jewish scholars, his looking upon the synagogue as a mere financial establishment which could only be sustained by rigid administration—in one word, it was his utter lack of any idea or ideal that, as already said, brought the majority of Zunz's colleagues to the verge of despair. Hate as they did every "rabbinical hierarchy", they still looked almost with envy on the Jews in Russia where the Rabbis still supplied some counterbalancing influence to this reign of the "financial saints" which drew its authority from no other source than its bank account. The ukase issued then by the Government of Russia for the organization of the Jewish communities in that country,

which destroyed the power of the *Parnasim*, was hailed by German scholars with joy, and they recommended it as a worthy example to be imitated by the Prussian Government. "Hierarchy", they declare, makes people ignorant, but this dominion of money makes them mean and degraded.[7]

Though Zunz did not despair, it cannot be denied that this "degraded condition" left in him a sting of bitterness which was never quite obliterated. Some great writer has said that he who did not become a misanthrope before he reached the fortieth year of his life never loved mankind thoroughly. Zunz did love Judaism with all his heart, but just this fact made him misanthropic. He was not an amiable man. He was by nature uncompromising and sarcastic; never bearing a smile on his lips and never uttering those honeyed empty phrases which are so nicely calculated to smooth the life of people in this world and to give them a fair passage into the other.

Heine tells us in one place that Zunz was not at all the favorite of the great masses.[8] But Zunz cared little for their likes and dislikes. Loyal as he was to his friends, recognizing their smallest merits, grateful for every aid given him in his literary efforts, regardful of every honest struggle after religious truth, whether it resulted in reform or orthodoxy—he was most unforgiving and unsparing towards the "lay heads" whom I have described as ruling the synagogue at that time, and he attacked them, their creations and their creatures, at every possible opportunity. "The Jews and Judaism," he writes to a friend after the dissolution of the *Verein*, which he wanted to reconstruct, "are

torn to pieces and are a prey to barbarians, idiots, fools, and Parnasim...All their institutions, the organization of their communities, their subscription lists, their scribbles, their preachers and their wardens, their aristocracy, their meetings, their press, their literature, and their book-trade bear all the features of our miserable condition...Our present Judaism is a sickening mixture of praying 'money-bags', *Rachmonus* (Charity), with a few crumbs of secular and rabbinic knowledge." When speaking of reforms in the synagogue, he declares the suppression of the arrogance of the rich in the house of God as one of the most important thereof. Most bitterly he felt the contempt in which both Jewish scholarship and Jewish scholars were held by fashionable and so-called educated people. He gave vent to his feelings in an article which was composed in the form of a letter to a friend. We give here a few extracts from it.

Alluding to the happy times when the friends lived and worked together, Zunz goes on to say: "Penetrating into the sanctuary of the ages, we perceived the genius which animated the author, and it was the voice of the genius which we caught from the inarticulate sounds of the book...'Every man,' you maintained, 'finds what he seeks for, and unloving, idle and ignorant contempt stigmatizes only itself.' In Jewish literature there is everything to be had, the human and the divine, the sincere and the humorous, storm and mayflowers. Indeed does it not treat of mathematics and free will as well as of love-letters and recipes for making ink? The gallant youth

who finds it beneath his dignity to understand Hebrew will find the rules for his behavior at a dancing party in Joseph Da Costa's work *Tractado de Cortesia*....

"You find it strange that the Jews in our large city are so ignorant about the men who are the bearers and the ornament of their history, that just among the educated classes there is so little known about the life and labor of Jewish great men except perhaps Maimonides and Mendelssohn who are of European fame. Well, I could rejoin that where the population is large, the ignorance is also great; but I will give you the real reason. Our large populations and their education produce very little of enthusiasm and ideal interest, and their want of knowledge (of Jewish history) is caused by their want of a great moral principle, by their indifference and their arrogance... The interest that we take in history and heroes arises from the idea or from our admiration of great deeds... You think that the Jewish public ought to know those who have been, during two thousand years, the representatives of our literature, that they ought to appreciate their noble efforts and sympathize with their sufferings. But from whom of their leaders could our public obtain this knowledge? To be sure, not from those writers who, trampling upon everything Jewish, unceasingly proclaim to the world that only with them is salvation to be found, and who look with hatred upon every book in which certain popular commodities are not offered or praised....

"The indifference of the Jews towards their celebrities grieved a great writer of three hundred and fifty years ago: 'All nations,' says Alami, 'praise

their princes and their heroes, and the space they give to the description of a single great man surpasses that of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah and Israel together; only we Jews are unable to tell some glorious deed of a single one of our coreligionists.' But the old Jews had neither the leisure nor did they consider it their calling to observe the life of some excellent men and make their contemporaries acquainted with it... In those times the individual had only to serve the idea and even of the whole of the nation there was no history. It was only in later ages that this desire of having some knowledge of their great men was awakened among the Jews; Jewish biographical literature is a creation of the notions of the eighteenth century... How much lies still buried under the dust, how many features of humanity and heroism have the blind overlooked, the dilettante writers obliterated! To sketch the individual after life, to give us a picture of the past by delineating its personages would be a work of higher merit than to introduce one's own precious self to the reader by means of lithography.—What a contrast does this readiness to perpetuate oneself form with the modesty of the old sages who even when they had already acquired great fame could hardly be persuaded to have themselves painted —a fact which we can only regret...From the seventeenth century I know hardly thirty portraits. Joseph del Medigo, Jacob Juda Leon, Benedict Spinoza, Isaac Orobio distinguished themselves while mere youths, and nevertheless they were nearly forty when the public obtained prints of them...Thank goodness, in the last twenty years we have no reason to complain

in this respect. The care taken for posterity goes so far that one must forsooth have oneself painted first and afterwards seek for some means to get famous.

"Do you still remember the times when we were reading those old antiquated books and marking those passages in which the souls of the dead authors were still speaking to us?...Anno 961 the judge Nathan in Cordova resigned his post that a talented but poor stranger might accept it...Maimonides could hardly conceive it possible that scholars should consent to accept a salary for their teaching...How much could our so-called respectable people learn from these rabbis! But I utterly forget that Jewish celebrities are not social celebrities, but only poor persecuted teachers and sufferers. For such people we have too little heart, too little enthusiasm and too little leisure, whilst, on the other hand, we possess too many acquaintances, too much money, and too much culture to care for them. Our carpet knights, who have got rid of everything Jewish, look upon all Jewish authors as upon idiots with whose activity the educated ladies of our fashionable drawing-room have sympathy no longer."[9]

So far the complaints of Zunz. These were undoubtedly a great deal exaggerated, the more so when we remember that at the time when this letter was composed (1845) Frankel and Geiger had already entered into the arena of Jewish literature. Each of them was editing a periodical which was chiefly devoted to rabbinic studies and which found

material and spiritual support among the better classes of the Jewish public.

But it is nevertheless true that at the time when Zunz began his work (1817–24) the position of the better or educated classes was most inimical towards the Rabbis and their productions. With the exception of a very few, they still lived in the notions of the eighteenth century with its characteristic utter want of appreciation for history and for the innumerable hidden processes through which history obtains its ends. The whole past of Judaism, therefore, extending from the conclusion of the Canon of the Bible up to Mendelssohn, lay before them as a vast blank which the disingenuousness of the sharp casuist and the vagaries of half-mad visionaries could by no means relieve. The Talmud and the Midrashim were considered as a perversion of the Pentateuch and the books of the Prophets, and the Jewish liturgy as a bad paraphrase of the Psalms.[10]

To destroy these false notions, to bridge over this seemingly wide and deep gap, to restore the missing links between the Bible and tradition, to prove the continuity and development of Jewish thought through history, to show their religious depth and their moral and ennobling influence, to teach us how our own age with all its altered notions might nevertheless be a stage in the continuous development of Jewish ideals and might make these older thoughts a part of its own progress—this was the great task to which Zunz devoted his life.

Zunz's literary activity, which extended over more

than half a century (1817-75), may be classified under the following headings:

1. History and development of the Jewish theological literature, or, what is almost the same, the history of Jewish homiletics.

2. History and development of Jewish liturgy.

3. History of Jewish literature and also of Jewish life and customs during the Middle Ages.

For the design of this essay, however, we think it advisable to make *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, or the History of Jewish Homiletics, which not only forms the chief work of the first class but is also universally considered as Zunz's masterpiece, the main subject of the following remarks. The *Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge* (cited hereafter as *G. V.*) is provided neither with an index nor with a full table of contents, a fact which renders its use sometimes rather difficult. We think, therefore, that we may be doing a good service to Jewish students by endeavoring for the first time to give a brief analysis of the *G. V.* Around it we shall group the other productions of Zunz as far as they concern Jewish literature.

Before entering into this *analysis, we have still to remark that even Zunz, in the beginning of his literary career, was not quite free from the prejudices of his time against Rabbinic literature. In one of his first literary attempts he still speaks of the "fighting for blind authority which goes on in the Talmud" and of the mission of "*its adversary*, heaven-born philosophy, which not only defeats but also pardons and

* To presume the continuity of thought of this essay, the editors have transferred this analysis to Appendix A.

recognizes the enemy."[11] But the other article, *Etwas über die rabbinische Literatur*, which was published in the same year, shows that Zunz was more eager for the recognition than for the defeat. And though Zunz dwells more on the gain which Jewish literature can offer to the historian and philologist than on the merits of this literature in and for itself, he never declared any branch of it as superfluous, and even the library of the manufacturer of the Zohar is most carefully catalogued as interesting to the critic.[12]

The real and the complete recognition of the merits of the Rabbis and their ideal efforts is to be found in the famous essay on Rashi with which Zunz surprised the world in 1823.[13] It was more than a surprise, nay, it meant as much as to challenge all the notions of the time, and inaugurated a bold rebellion against them. Certainly the Bible was still kept in high respect, "if only on account of its noble affinity with Christianity". Maimonides and Ibn Ezra also enjoyed some repute for the sake of their acquaintance with Plato and Aristotle. But who cared for the poor Rabbis who could not boast of such aristocratic connections, not to speak of their commentators and super-commentators? But such was the hero of the essay— Rashi himself as well as his teachers and his pupils, whom Zunz introduced on this occasion to the astonished Jewish public. They were mere Talmudists, who neither understood nor misunderstood the Greek philosophers and nevertheless needed no justification for their existence. Their significance is proved by their conscientious work, and their greatness consists in their pure lives. This essay we

may consider as Zunz's first larger attempt in the field of pure Rabbinical literature.

We can now pass on to the *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden historisch entwickelt*, or The History and Development of Jewish Homiletics, which, begun by Zunz in 1829,[14] appeared, as is to be seen from its title page, in 1832. It was during these three years that he carried on the lively correspondence with Rapoport, of which he speaks in the preface of this work (p.xiii). And thus the *G. V.* perhaps also incorporates Rapoport's best thoughts on the midrashic literature.

We have no means of ascertaining the impression the *G. V.* made on the mind of the Jewish students when it made its first appearance; for there existed no Jewish press at that time in Germany. We are thus confined in this respect to a few meagre sentences which give only a very inadequate notion of the immediate effects that the *G. V.* had on the mind of Zunz's contemporaries. Thus Geiger writes in 1833 to his friend M. A. Stern: "In Jewish literature there have appeared two remarkable works: the new history of Jost.....the other by the very learned Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge*..... from which title one could hardly anticipate the splendid arrangement and richly elaborated scholarship therein displayed." [15]

From the Christian side we may call attention here to the words of Gefrörer who said that since the days of Spinoza there had not appeared from the pen of a Jew a work so good and thorough as the *G. V.*[16] More zealous admiration was

shown by the less famous but more enthusiastic writer D. Caro, who almost immediately after the appearance of the *G. V.* devoted himself to its translation into Hebrew, a labor which cost him more than thirteen months' steady work.[17]

With these few lines, however, almost all the allusions to the *G. V.* by Germans during the first eight years after the publication of this work are exhausted. It is to Poland that we have to turn for the only review of the *G. V.* which has ever been written. We refer to the well-known book *Rabiah* (ראב"ה) (Ofen, 1837) by Samiler, a Polish rabbi from Brody, who wrote under the pseudonym of Mehlsag. This review certainly shows the great command by its author of Rabbinic literature; but it displays very little critical power, and the positive results at which Samiler arrives are hardly of any value to us. One merit cannot be denied to this reviewer: it is his *reductio ad absurdum* method of ascertaining the authors of certain anonymous Piyyutim by means of *Gematriot*; and it was through the sarcastic parodies of Samiler that this ingenious word-play has disappeared from Jewish literature forever.[18]

Perhaps we might also mention the work *Iggeret Bikkoret* by H. Chajes (Zolkiew, 1840), which for the greater part treats of the same subjects that are discussed in the *G. V.* Chajes makes ample use of this latter work, though he does not care to quote the name of Zunz, whom he also occasionally attacks.[19] The *G. V.* would have been perhaps still more discussed in Poland if it had not been written in a language which the great majority of Jewish

scholars in that country were unable to understand. And it will always remain a matter of great regret that the above-mentioned Hebrew translation of the *G. V.* by Caro was allowed to remain unpublished. As it was, the influence of the *G. V.* on the Polish Jews was very small, and we have again to return to the west of Europe.

The light of Jewish science was to come from Germany, as Zunz predicted or rather hoped. The *G. V.* kindled the flame, and it was by its own light that students studied it as well as wrote reviews on it; not reviews of a mere negative character, but such as were destined to become in themselves a part of Jewish science. Real work of this character was done slowly but thoroughly. What we have in mind are the numerous monographs on certain single points and the many critical editions of Rabbinical works to which we have reference in the notes on the analysis of the *G. V.*

As to the verdict of these writers there is little doubt that it does not prove in all cases favorable to Zunz. Many treasures hidden in manuscripts have, since the appearance of the *G. V.*, been brought to light giving certainty where Zunz could only work with mere hypotheses. Certain subjects, again, were taken up by specialists who devoted to them whole treatises, while Zunz, in accordance with the design of his work, had to dismiss them with a few lines. Thus the reader who would care to consult the authorities of the last fifty years (many of which are given in our notes) will find that there are many points in the *G. V.* which must now be considered

as entirely antiquated, or which at least cannot be accepted without certain modifications.

But apart from the new discoveries and the advantages which the specialist enjoys over the general historian, we should like to hint further at two other faults of the *G. V.* First, that Zunz has to say so little about the *Midrash Halakah*. Krochmal, Geiger, Weiss, and others have clearly proved that there is development in the Halakah, too, and that this development closely corresponds with the great historical events of the different ages from which the various Halakahs date.[20] Now Zunz himself declares that both the written and the oral Law are subject to modifications (*G. V.* 43, 51), but he neglected telling us when these modifications were made and what were the guiding motives of the modifiers.

Another important point which is greatly felt in the *G. V.* is that Zunz, successful as he was in restoring the unity and continuity of Jewish literature in itself, has almost nothing to say of its relations to other literatures and their mutual influences. But the reader will remember that this was considered as the second part of the problem which Jewish science had to solve. Many successors of Zunz had done their best to supply this want.[21] But the *G. V.* would have been the right place for the treatment of such subjects. Still it must not be forgotten that the adequate treatment of these two subjects would have necessitated the writing of large treatises by themselves.

Zunz's researches were, however, in the meantime directed towards other questions which he thought more important than anything else, and to which his later

studies were almost entirely devoted. We have been speaking of Zunz's reviewers. We have also indicated that the work of Zunz's real reviewers did not consist in attacking the master, but in following his suggestions and in correcting and completing him. As we remember, chapter XXI of the *G. V.* is devoted to the development of the later Haggadah where the Piyyutim are considered as such. The literary productions of the Franco-German schools during the Middle Ages are also touched upon.

Zunz proved his own best reviewer in following his own suggestions and expanding the contents of the chapter mentioned above into two special branches of Jewish science. We refer to the chief work of Zunz, written after the publication of the *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, the book *Zur Geschichte und Literatur* (Berlin, 1845), mainly devoted to the history of the literature of the Jews as well as of their life and customs during the Middle Ages, and his other books,—*Die Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1855), *Die Ritus des Synagogalen Gottesdienstes* (Berlin, 1859) and the *Literaturgeschichte der Synagogalen Poesie* (Berlin, 1865), in which three works the author is occupied with the history of the Jewish liturgy, for the most part with the history of the Piyyutim.

The book *Zur Geschichte und Literatur* was preceded by several other minor essays, which, bearing upon the same subjects, may be considered as a preparation for this larger work.[22] However, the fact must not be passed over in silence that even the *Zur Geschichte und Literatur* has no claim to be looked upon as a really finished book. It looks more

like a collection of essays on various subjects relating to Judaism without any essential connection and continuity. The very title itself, *Zur Geschichte*, meaning "Contributions towards the history, etc.", already indicates the incompleteness of the work. And Zunz himself most distinctly points to this drawback in his work when he says: "The following paragraphs claim only to arrange the material concerning literature in historical order and to give various hints about that (literary) activity" (p. 29).

But if the *Zur Geschichte* cannot be considered as a complete work in itself, it certainly furnishes the student with material and suggestions for the writing of many works. We cannot enter here into a full analysis of this book. The bibliographical and biographical character of some parts and the variety of matter in other parts would make such an attempt almost impossible. [See Appendix B.]

Complete and finished in every respect are Zunz's works on the history of liturgy. These researches, to which, as already mentioned, the first impulse was given to him by the contents of Chapter XXI of his own *G. V.*, occupied him, though not infrequently interrupted by other work, through more than forty years. His larger works bearing upon this subject of Jewish liturgy are the books already noticed, the *Synagogale Poesie*, *Ritus*, and *Literaturgeschichte der Synagogalen Poesie*. This last Zunz seems to have considered as his chief work of this class, the former two being described by him as preparatory works to the *Literaturgeschichte*. But nevertheless we do not think that the student would care to lose either of

these two great books. As Zunz himself felt, he succeeded in his last great work (the *Literaturgeschichte*) more in acquainting the world with the names of the liturgical poets and the titles of their poems than with the history of the Piyyut.[23] For this we shall have always to turn to the pages of the *Synagogale Poesie* and the *Ritus*. [See Appendix C.]

Some conception of the importance of the *Literaturgeschichte* (which, as we have just pointed out, is more bibliographical in character) may be gathered from the index to this book compiled by Mr. Gestetner. The student will see from this index that the *Literaturgeschichte* describes more than 6,000 different liturgical pieces, besides assigning the names of their authors as far as they could be ascertained.[24] In this field of Jewish science Zunz superseded all the works of his predecessors.[25] Indeed he did more, for to judge from the discoveries made since the appearance of the *Literaturgeschichte* and the *Nachträge* to it (1867), Zunz will perhaps also remain the last authority on the subject. These few discoveries certainly enlarge the number of known Piyyutim but they add very little information concerning the Paitanim, and it is hardly possible that many new rites are destined in the future to be brought to light.[26]

Lest the rather detailed and even minute character of the preceding account* of Zunz's chief books might decrease the impression of grandeur and vastness only to be seen from perspective, we shall have to pass now to general remarks. A few recapitulatory words are necessary.

*Transferred to Appendices A, B and C.

In the remarkable preface of the *G. V.* Zunz expresses himself in these memorable words: "For all true instruction we need the spoken word. Men have gained all their spiritual treasures by word of mouth; an education continuing through all the stages of life. So, too, in Israel the words of instruction passing from mouth to mouth were always heard and any further development of Jewish institutions can only come from the spoken words pouring forth light and knowledge." All his successive work forms a vivid illustration of these pregnant suggestions.

As already hinted, what was most and first wanted was to bridge over the seemingly wide and deep gap between the written and the spoken word, or in other words to prove the connection between Scriptures and tradition. This connection Zunz established in the first three chapters of the *G. V.*, on the one hand, by proving the late date of certain portions of the Bible, by showing that they already constituted a part of tradition; and, on the other hand, by maintaining the antiquity of certain institutions of the Synagogue (which is at once the creation and creator of tradition).

Having succeeded in this attempt, it was a comparatively easy task for Zunz to trace out the continuity of the spoken word in the later centuries, the literature of which is abundant and copious, and throughout which all the countries where Jews were scattered contributed toward the development of oral teaching. The only difficulty was to give every century its due and to fix the place of every Midrash. To in-

quiries along these lines the greatest part of the subsequent chapters are devoted.

Zunz was celebrated for his accuracy and thoroughness. He did not refrain even from giving us whole monographs on the meaning of a single word or term.[27] One of the chief characteristics of the *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* is the author's entering into the minutest details about almost every single point under discussion. Still Zunz never loses sight of the chief aim of his work, and the continuity and unity of Jewish literature are points to which he turns again and again. The books of the prophets are termed the words of tradition (קבלה, *G. V.* 43-44). Certain chapters of Jeremiah, the stories in the books of Chronicles, as well as the greater part of Daniel, belong to the historical Haggadah (119–125). Isaiah and Ezekiel are the first mystical writers (157-163), and the first germs of the interpretatory or exegetical Midrash are not only to be found in Hosea, Ezekiel, etc., but might also be discovered in the Pentateuch itself (170–177).

The prophecy and the Haggadah are both natural expressions of the religious life of the nation (322). And though with the loss of the national independence the voice of the prophets becomes gradually silenced, the voice of God still continues to be heard. Israel continues to consult God through the medium of the Scriptures, and He answers the people through the mouth of the Soferim, the sages, the interpreters of the Law and the Prophets (331-344). And this voice of God is audible to them also through the literature of the Middle Ages with its glossators, exegetes, grammarians, and ethical teachers—a literature which "is a re-

flex of the divine spirit...and the sum and crest of which offers us a view of what the noblest minds felt and longed for, of what they sought, loved, and also obtained, and for which they sacrificed that which was mortal in them" (*Zur Geschichte*, 2).

The same continuity and development which Zunz finds in Jewish thought, he discovered also in Jewish sentiment. The highest and noblest expression of this sentiment is the Jewish liturgy, which takes root at the time when Psalms were still being composed (*G. V.*, 367), and which, in its later stages, grows by the paitanic additions in such rich luxuriance "that it forms by itself a treasure of religion and history, of poetry and philosophy, and prophecy and Psalms are revived in the Piyyut and the Selihahof the Middle Ages" (*Synagogale Poesie*, 8).

After the foregoing remarks we may perhaps proceed to say a few words about Zunz's idea of Judaism. According to him, Judaism represents a religion and a continuous revelation. For us the prophets did not cease with the books of the prophets, and the Psalmists did not die in the times of the Maccabees. "All books," he tells in one place, "the Bible not excepted, were originally not the source of the creed, but its testimony; they were produced by belief, not *vice versa*" (*Gesammelte Schriften.*, II, 237).

But this claim of being a production of belief may also be made on behalf of the post-Biblical works such as the Mishnah, the Talmud, the responsa of the Geonim, and the literary productions of the following Rabbinic ages. The whole of Jewish literature, in so far as it expresses "the thoughts

and actions of men" (*Gesammelte Schriften*, I, p. 123) thus attains almost the same importance as the Scriptures themselves. Hence Zunz's aversion to the Karaites, whom he never failed to attack (*Ritus*, p. 156 *seq*) even at a period when the new discoveries of Firkowitch and Pinsker threatened us with a kind of a literary "Pan-Karaism," an aversion which he displayed also towards certain anti-Rabbinic tendencies of his time. "Highly cultivated minds like Maimonides, Ibn Ezra, Mendelsohn, were able to build up new systems on the basis of tradition" (Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, V, 184), and we might add perhaps that to other minds, as for instance Spinoza, even the Bible did not prove a safe enough basis on which "to build".

Now this love and reverence for Jewish literature could not fail to extend itself to the Jewish nation, the creators of this literature. And the paitanic compositions inspired Zunz to the following inimitable lines which we give here in the excellent translation that George Eliot prefixed as the motto to one of her chapters in *Daniel Deronda*: "If there are ranks in suffering, Israel takes precedence of all the nations—if the duration of sorrow and patience with which they are born ennoble, the Jews are among the aristocracy of every land—if a literature is called rich in the possession of a few classic tragedies, what shall we say to a national Tragedy lasting for fifteen hundred years, in which the poets and the actors were also the heroes?" (*Synagogale Poesie*, p. 8)

But we must not think that Zunz's hopes as to the future of the Jewish nation have anything in common with that expressed in *Daniel Deronda*.

There is not in the whole writing of Zunz a single passage that would prove that its author cherished the hopes the realization of which forms the highest ideal of Mordecai—certainly he would strongly condemn the denial of the past and the surrender of the future. The abolition of the rite of circumcision meant for Zunz* [suicide (*Gesammelte Schriften*, II, 199).....
....Secular] poems written in Hebrew and composed by Jewish poets, claim his attention as well as any Piyyut or Selihah. But the fact is that they concern him very little, for the sublimest idea which adorns humanity is the *Gottesbegriff* or religion. And the Synagogue, with its inculcating and developing the word of God amidst all sufferings and troubles, becomes for Zunz the sublimest expression of Israel's life. And it matters to him very little whether these teachings were uttered in the language of the Scriptures or in Aramaic or French or German, or whether this utterance of a longing for God was expressed in the fine Hebrew of the Spanish writers or in the inartistic tones of the German Paitanim, as long as they had the effect of impressing the devout mind with the idea that "God is the soul of Israel." And this effect certainly no one can deny to the writings of the Jews in the Middle Ages.

It will, however, be a mistake to suppose Zunz to belong to the romantic school who seek their salvation only in the Middle Ages and have no eye for the present. Indeed he was reproached by some on the ground that he stood aloof from the religious movements of his time, and that his later productions

* At this point a page of the author's manuscript is missing.

have contributed little to the inner development of Judaism.[28] To be sure, twice he entered upon a practical career as a Jewish minister, and he was successful on neither occasion. Once he acted as preacher in Berlin (1820–1823), and a second time he filled the similar office in Prague (1835), where he remained but for a short time. But it will always remain a question whether the fault lay more with him or in the sad condition of the Jewish communities during the interregnum which we endeavored to describe at the opening of this essay.

When we read the following passages, we see the reason why Zunz could not have acted otherwise than resign his clerical office. "Especially," he writes in the preface of his *Sermons* which appeared in 1823, "I dedicate (these sermons) to the attention of those few who effected the decay of our synagogue here, and despised the voice of truth; and whose insults and absurdities caused me to find that I owe it to my honor, to my principles, nay, to the welfare of the whole community, to lay down my post as a Jewish preacher—notwithstanding vanity and income." And we have an allusion to the sad condition under which he lived in Prague in the Letters of Rapoport, in which in a letter dated 1836, the author writes to Luzzatto: "Zunz was appointed as rabbi in Prague some seven years ago, but alas! his congregation, Landau included, are unable to understand and to appreciate his greater merits" (p. 84).

However, it is not our concern to meddle here

with the struggle between Zunz and his Parnasim. It may be that he did not always understand his Parnasim; for Landau, the editor of the *'Aruk* and the translator of the *Mahzor*, was a man of great practical merits in Judaism, his bad etymologies notwithstanding. It may be that Zunz committed sometimes the fault of considering as trifles certain things which were looked upon by others as of vital importance. And in his *Kurze Antworten auf Kultusfragen* (*Gesammelte Schriften*, II, 204) he does not conceal a certain impatience on being disturbed with ritual questions. This brochure is headed by the motto: "God hath made men upright; but they thought out many inventions," and it concludes with the wish that the time may soon arrive, when acquaintance with the science of Judaism will make both such questions and answers superfluous.

But if he failed in the pulpit, in his historical works he did far more good for Judaism than any man in the nineteenth century. It is usually not the business of the historian to help make history. But Zunz's works did make history; they did not mean to tell us a curious story from the past which, interesting as it may be, concerns and influences our present very little or not at all. His history was, to speak with Emerson, a "belief in eternity". And as the great American essayist desired that "we as we read must become Greeks, Romans, Turks, priest and king, martyr and executioner, must fasten these images to some reality in our secret experience, or we shall learn nothing rightly", so Zunz wanted that as we read the history of Judaism, we should ourselves again become, if not priests and zealots, than at least prophets, Sof-

erim, sages, philosophers, poets, and, if it should become necessary, also martyrs for the idea.

As is well known, Zunz's greatest work was partly written with the tendency of justifying and revising the institution of teaching or preaching in the synagogue. Surely, "only charlatans make new religions", he expresses himself in one passage. But there is no necessity for making new ones, as soon as we understand the history of religion rightly. Both in the *G. V.* and in his successive works he suggests to us: here you have the synagogue as a living body with its two great institutions of praying and teaching. The prophets and the Soferim come, and when these disappear they are followed by the sages. New and mighty religions emerge which menace the synagogue in its very existence, and it survives their attacks. New theories about God and man become prevalent which are rather hostile to Judaism, but Jewish philosophers understand how to assimilate them and enrich them by the treasury of ideas possessed by the synagogue. And when the danger became greatest we see a noble band of thinkers and scholars placing themselves in the service of the synagogue which they defend by their life and death. And notwithstanding the great battle they have to fight, they bequeath to us a literature "containing such a treasure of history, philosophy, and poetry, second to no other literature". What now prevents us from building on this basis and from enlarging this treasure by the best ideas of our time for the benefit of posterity as our ancestors did for us?

It is difficult to say what turn Judaism would have

taken without the influence of Zunz in those parts of the world where the Jews have already ceased, or have not as yet begun, to think, and in which the respect for institutions is so great that the fact of their mere existence is sufficient reason for maintaining them. In these countries Judaism will always remain the private property of the Parnasim and a matter of indifference to the great bulk of the community. But happily there are also other countries, and they contain the great majority of the Jews, where people do think and where the power of the idea is so great that nothing else but ideas could reconcile them with Judaism. For these countries Zunz did a saving work by revealing to them the great idea of Judaism, and it is in these countries that we have to look for the future of Judaism.

Zunz was blessed with a long life. He lived to see the fruits of his works. He saw the bridging over of the interregnum and the restitution of the idea in its rightful place. He saw how the men of the idea combined with men of means, and erected those institutions for spreading the knowledge and science of Judaism such as perhaps surpassed his hopes. And he saw a young generation rising up devoting itself with the greatest enthusiasm to the work which the Master had begun.

Indefatigably Zunz worked for the *Emanzipation des Geistes* until the eightieth year of his life. But the death of his wife, Adelheid Zunz, the constant companion of all his labors, his troubles, and his successes through more than half a century, broke his heart and spirits, and it is not known that he wrote

anything of consequence after that time. His death occurred on March 17, in the year 1886. His work had to pass on to younger hands. He had done enough through all his life to bear out his motto: *Echte Wissenschaft ist thaterzeugend.* These last years he had only lived in the reminiscences of the past, in the reminiscences of those days of which he said: "I confess that next to resignation to the will of God, it is the science of Judaism in which I find my only comfort and stay".

APPENDIX A

Analysis of the Chapters of the Gottesdienstliche Vorträge

I: Introduction

After the loss of Israel's independence the synagogue becomes the centre of the national and religious life (1); the two prominent functions of which, praying and teaching, may be traced back to the times of the prophets (2). The reading of the Torah which was already customary in the Maccabean period is the oldest method of teaching in the synagogue—different orders of reading: the cycle of three years in Palestine, according to others three years and a half (3); the one-year cycle in Babylon, where the feast of Rejoicing of the Law was also first introduced. The division of the portions usual in the present day is of a comparatively later date (4). The days on which the Law was read (besides the Sabbath), the number of the people who read it. Reading from the Prophets (*Haftarah*) corresponding with the lesson from the Pentateuch. The antiquity of the *Haftarot* (5–6), whilst their order and selection is of a much later period. The *Haftarot* from the Hagiographa in the afternoon service on Sabbath are customary in Babylon.[29] The language of the Bible little understood, which fact leads to the introduction

of the Targumim, also written down at a very early period.[30] But these Aramaic translations no longer satisfied all the religious wants of the time, because not only the language of the Bible, but also its contents became obscure in the course of centuries. The legal part (in the Pentateuch) also proved insufficient for altered circumstances; other laws were never carried out. These facts gave birth to the sermon or lecture, which, interpreting and completing the Bible, soon became by the side of the reading of the Law and the translation (Targum) an essential part of the divine service (10–12).

II: Chronicles

The extinction of prophecy (13), the Hagiographa, the nature and character of the single books (14-17), especially of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles; full analysis of these books, their exegetical and legendary tendency, proves that they form only one work composed by one author who lived not earlier than 312 and not later than 260 B. C. (17-31), and was thus a contemporary of the "Men of the Great Synagogue" (32).[31]

III: Midrash

It is in these post-prophetic parts of the Bible, more especially in Chronicles and Daniel, that the germs of the Midrash on its haggadic side are to be found (35). The prophets were replaced by the Synhedrion, the "sons of the prophets", by the Talmidim (disciples), Simon the Just,[32] the last member of the Men of the Great Synagogue, whose activity is interrupted by the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes (36).

The institution of the Synhedrion and its two presidents the *Nasi* and the *Ab-Bet-Din* (37). Their zealous efforts in diffusing the knowledge of the Torah and spreading its ideals. The struggle between the Pharisees and the Sadducees and the triumph of the former. The institution of the בתי מדרש (schools). The titles Rabbi and Rabban (38).[33] The literary character of this period and many centuries after (both among the Jews and the Christians) is midrashic (40-41).

Two kinds of Midrash: *Midrash Halakah* and *Midrash Haggadah* (42); the former represents the legal and practical side of tradition, and is thus more a product of reason, resting greatly on authority and consequently more stable, whilst the latter appeals more to the heart, originating mainly from the impulses of the moment, and therefore admitting rapid development.[34]

Germs of the *Midrash Halakah* are already to be found in Ezekiel (43). All the books of the Bible (except the Pentateuch) form a part of tradition (קבלה), and more or less modify and complement the Torah (44, 45).[35] The oldest halakic collection (Mishnah) by the school of Hillel, the Mishnah of R. Akiba, and lastly the Mishnah of Rabbi.[36] The halakic Midrashim: the *Sifra* (46), *Sifre*, *Mekilta* (47), and the *Sifre Zuta*.[37]

The existence of other Mishnayyot besides that of Rabbi, the Baraitas (48), especially the Tosefta by R. Hiyya and R. Hoshaya (50).[38] In the course of time also these collections were in need of being explained and interpreted, which caused the rise of the Talmud (51). The two Talmudim, the Tal-

mud Yerushalmi and the Talmud Babli (51–55).[39] The so-called *Rabbanan Saburai* and their activity.[40] The *Halakot Gedolot* by R. Simon Kahira, and also those by the pupils of R. Yehudai Gaon (56). The *Sheeltot*, the literary production of the Geonim, the cessation of the Babylonian schools (57).[41]

IV: Haggadah

The difference between Halakah and Haggadah (58). Three ways of explaining the Scriptures: *Peshat*, the simple understanding of words and things; *Derash*, reflecting, by means of homiletical explanation, "the current condition of things in the mirror of prophecy"; *Sod*, mystical and allegorical interpretation of the Bible (59). Classification of the Haggadah into general Haggadah (such as history, ethics, etc.) and special Haggadah, more confined to the explanation of the Scriptures (60). Six literary groups which have to be noticed with regard to the Haggadah: The *Targumim;* haggadic fragments in halakic works; ethical Haggadah; historical Haggadah; mysticism; special Haggadah or haggadic interpretations of the Scriptures (61).

V: Targumim

The antiquity of the *Targumim*. The *Targum Onkelos* and that of Jonathan (62). Interpolations in the latter (63). The *Targum* to the Hagiographa (64-65). The *Pseudo-Jonathan* on the Pentateuch and the *Targum Yerushalmi*, which are two versions of the same work (65-77); fragments of the *Targum*

Yerushalmi on other Biblical books, and lastly the Targum of *Akilas* (77-83).

VI: Haggadic Fragments in the Works of the Midrash and the Halakah

In the *Sifra*, *Sifre*, *Sifre Zuta*, the *Mekilta* (84), the *Seder 'Olam* (85).[42] The thirty-two Rules by Rabbi Eliezer ben Jose ha-Galili,[43] the *Baraita of the Meleket ha-Mishkan*, or the description of the Tabernacle (86).[44] Again, haggadic fragments in the Mishna extending either over whole tractates such as the *Masseket Middot* (historical Haggadah)[45] or *Masseket Abot*, ethical Haggadah (87); or over a few sentences scattered in the different tractates at various places as well as in the Tosefta.

Again, haggadic fragments in the quotations of the Talmud from the Baraitot. *Tana de-be R. Ishmael*[46] and the *Seder Eliyyahu* (88); as well as in the so-called Minor Tractates (89–91),[47] and in the lost *Baraita* or Mishnah of the 49 *Middot* (92).[48] There also existed Baraitot on medicine,[49] geometry, and on the calendar, the Baraita of Adda and Samuel (93).[50] Large haggadic fragments scattered over the two Talmudim (94), as well as in the halakic works of the Geonim. The tractate *Soferim* (95),[51] the *Sheeltot* of R. Aha (96),[52] the *Halakot Gedolot*[53] and other works and responses by the Geonim (97).[54]

VII: The Ethical Haggadah

Its manifold character and various forms (98, 99). The fable literature, especially the fables of R. Meir

(100),[55] the gnomology in the apocryphal books, Ecclesiasticus (Jesus ben Sirach), the Wisdom of Solomon (101-105). The lost work *Megillat Setarim*, or *Megillat Hasidim*, which also contained ethical precepts and sayings.[56] The whole of the Tractate Abot.[57] The chapter *Kinyan Torah* (107) and the Minor Tractates: *Abot de-Rabbi Natan* (109),[58] *Derek Erez Rabbah* and *Zuta*, and the *Perek ha-Shalom* (110-111).[59] Again the works *Tana de-be Eliyyahu* (112-117)[60] and the *Midrash Temurah* (118).[61]

VIII: The Historical Haggadah

Traces of it in Biblical books (119). Historic Haggadah in the literature succeeding the Hadrianic age. The Wisdom of Solomon, Josephus, the New Testament, the additions to Esther, the Additions to Daniel, the Books of the Maccabees, Judith, Aristeas, and the book of Tobit (120-125). Historical Haggadah in works from the Talmudic period. The *Haggadah shel Pesah* (126-127),[62] the *Megillat Yuhasin* and Book of Adam (128).[63] Lost haggadic collections of which the earlier authorities made use, among them R. Nissim (129).[64] Historic haggadic composition of the time of the Geonim. *Megillat Antiochus* (134)[65] *Seder 'Olam Zuta* (135-139),[66] *Eldad ha-Dani*,[67] the Book of Zerubbabel,[68] the Story of R. Joshua ben Levi (141),[69] the *Midrash Eleh Ezkerah* (on the execution of the ten martyrs (142),[70] the Midrash on the Ten Commandments (143),[71] the *Midrash Wayyis'u*,[72] the chronicle of Moses (145), the Midrashim on the death of Moses and that of Aaron,[73] *Josippon*,[74] and the *Sefer ha-Yashar*.[75]

IX: Mysticism

Beginning with the vision of Ezekiel. Criticism of this book (157-162).[76] Explanatory attempts in the Wisdom of Solomon. The Secret of the Creation. Traces of it in Ben Sira and Philo. Mysticism in the Talmud (164). The *Sefer Yezirah* (165).[77] The mystical character of certain chapters in the *Baraita de-Rabbi Eliezer*. The Baraita of *Merkabah* and *Ma'aseh Bereshit* (166). The Book of *Raziel*, the Alphabet of R. Akiba (168), the *Midrash Konen*, and the *Sefer ha-Yashar* (169).[78]

X: Exegetical or Special Haggadah

Germs of it already in the Pentateuch (170), in the books of the Prophets, and also in the Hagiographa (171). Interpretation and application of words of the Scriptures in the literary production of the pre-Hadrianic time; the Wisdom of Solomon, the Second Book of the Maccabees, the Meditations of the Essenes, the Traditions of the old Sages, the Targumim (171); Philo, Aristeas, Josephus, and the New Testament. But the real exegetical Haggadah in all its fulness begins with the period of the Tannaim—the Torah of R. Meir containing haggadic notes on the margin (172).[79] Enumeration of midrashic collections of this kind (173). The *Bereshit Rabbah* (173-179); the *Midrash Ekah Rabbati* and the *Midrash Wayyikra Rabbah* (180-184).[80]

XI. The Pesikta (de-Rab Kahana)

Attempt to restore this Pesikta from quotations (185-226).[81]

XII: Yelammedenu (226-238)[82]

XIII: The Pesikta Rabbati (239-251)[83]

XIV: The other Midrashim to the Pentateuch

The *Midrash Debarim Rabbah* (252). The *Debarim Zuta* (253).[84] The Midrash Rabbah to the last five chapters of *Bereshit* and also another Midrash to the Blessing of Jacob (254-255); the *Aggadat Bereshit* (256); the *Shemot Rabbah* and the *Bemidbar Rabbah* (258-262).[85]

XV: Midrashim to other Biblical Books

The Midrash to the Song of Songs or *Aggadat Hazita* (263); the Midrash Esther (264);[86] the Midrash to the Psalms (266);[87] Proverbs (2648), and Samuel (269), and the Midrashim on Job, Isaiah, Jonah,[88] Ezra and Chronicles, most of which are lost (270).

XVI: Baraita de-Rabbi Eliezer (271-278)[89]

XVII: Single Haggadic Pieces

Midrash Abba Gorion;[90] *Midrash Esfa* (279);[91] *Midrash Tadshe* (280);[92] *Midrash Wayekullu; Midrash Hashkem* (281);[93] *Midrash Wayyosha*;[94] *Midrash Abkir* (282);[95] and *Midrash Haftarot* (283).[96] Again the midrashic pieces: The *Midrash Ta'ame Haserot Wiyeterot*;[97] the *Ma'aseh Torah*, the Midrash on the Three Things (284); the *Shemini Othothav* and the *Huppat Eliyyahu* (285).[98]

XVIII: R. Moses ha-Darshan (287-293)[99]

R. Tobia ben Eliezer (94).[100] R. Simon ha-Darshan (295-303).[101]

XIX: The Haggadah as an Organized Body

Recapitulation of its history and development through nearly fifteen centuries (500 B.C.E.–975 C.E.) which may divided into seven epochs (304–308).[102]

Characteristics of the two schools, the one in Palestine and the other in Babylon (309).[103] The beginnings of a Jewish literature in Europe in the ninth century. First in Italy, afterward also in France and Germany to which countries certain haggadic collections owe their origin (311-321). Different forms of Haggadah. Characteristics of the earlier and later Haggadah (311-341).[104] Its religious and political (national) tendency, its position towards the Halakah, development of the former from the prophecy (322). Various appellations of the Haggadists (lecturers) (324). The Haggadist is not bound to any fixed rule in his interpretation of Scripture (325). Various methods of application (325-329).[105]

XX: The System of Lecturing in Antiquity

Brief account of the history of the lecture from the time of the schools of Hillel and Shammai, where the evidence for the existence of this institution becomes clearer and stronger, and from thence up to the time of Hadrian (329-333).[106] Lectures on different

occasions (334-337). Various expressions for the word lecture and lecturer, the Meturgeman (338). The places where the lectures were given; the behavior of the public during the lecture; the hour for the lecture (338-340); increasing popularity of the Haggadist and the Haggadah (341–347).[107]

The existence of the haggadic lecture in Greece and in Italy, possibly also in Spain and in France (349). The main subjects of the lecture are of a religious and moral nature, but sometimes also intermixed with other elements (350). The structure of the lecture and other technical phrases (351–356).[108] The vernacular used for the lecture (357). The permission to write down the Haggadah at a very early period (359).

XXI: Later Haggadah Developments

Jews coming in contact with the Arabs. Their taking part in science (361). Transference of Jewish learning to Europe. Italy, Spain, and France (362). The existence of great Jewish scholars in Italy as well as in Spain already in the ninth century (363). The story of the four captured Geonim (364).[109] Traces of Jewish literature in France and Germany (365).[110] The history of homiletics (Haggadah) in Europe. Its development into philosophical and kabbalistic expositions of the Scriptures, or becoming a part of the liturgy (366).

The history of the liturgy and its development (366–370). The beginning of the Piyyut, by Kalir in Italy (380–389).[111] Imitators of Kalir

(389–392). Later Paitanim (393). The Piyyut deals chiefly with haggadic elements, though it cultivates sometimes also halakic, philosophic, and mystical subjects (394). The earliest commentaries on the Talmud and the Haggadah (397-398). Maimonides the founder of the rationalistic school for the interpretation of the Haggadah, and his followers (399). The Spanish and the German schools in their various relations to the Haggadah (400-402).[112] The kabbalistic schools (404-414).[113]

XXII: System of Lecturing in the First Rabbinic Age

Beginning with the close of the gaonic period. The one-year cycle becomes prevalent (410). New arrangements concerning the reading of the Law (411). The translation of the Law in connection with the reading is abolished (413). But the lecture is continued (415). The Darshan and his functions on different occasions (417). The persecutions in Germany prevent a deeper study of the Haggadah (418). The religious poetry in Spain and its difference in character from the Piyyut (419). The lecture in Spain (421), Italy (422), in Candia, Egypt, in the north of Africa (423), and the liturgy and the lecture of the Karaites.[114]

XXIII: System of Lecturing in the Second Rabbinic Age

The expulsion of the Jews from Spain. Immigration to Turkey (428). Enumeration of distinguished lecturers during the period in Turkey, Holland,

England, and chiefly Italy, who lecture in the vernacular of every country (429-434). The spirit and form of the lecture, the position of the lecturer, and the places where the lectures were given (435-436). Germany. The sufferings of the Jews in this country. Decay of science among them, corruption of the language (437), though in former centuries they used to speak pure German (438-440).[115] The Jargon (440). The sad conditions of the scholars. The immigration of foreign rabbis from Poland, their bad effects on the development of the lecture (441-443); though both Germany and Poland possessed still many lecturers or travelling preachers (445). The lecture intermixed with Kabbalah and given in Jargon. The complaints against these evils (446-447).

XXIV: Review of the Present Time

The overthrow of the old time. The awakening of Europe (494). The period of Mendelssohn. His own and his friends' efforts to spread culture and enlightenment among the Jews. Foundation of schools, etc. (450-454). The three institutions which need reform. The training-school of the rabbis, the teaching of religion and service, and the attempts made toward reforming them, especially the abolition of the pilpulistic lecture and the introduction of the German sermon (455-468). The religious conditions of the Jews in other countries: France (469), The Netherlands, England, America (471), Italy (472), Turkey, Egypt (474), Tunis, Palestine, and Persia (475). The mission of the German Jews in reforming Judaism and the nature of this reform (476-481).

APPENDIX B

Brief Analysis of Zur Geschichte

Some approach to such an analysis was made by Beer (*Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums*, 1846, pp. 264, 346, 472, *seq.*) and Philippson (*Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, 1846, Nos. 6,7,8,9) in their reviews of the *Zur Geschichte*. The book is provided with a table of contents running as follows: 1. Jewish literature.—2. The medieval literature of the Jews in France and Germany (with the subdivisions: Introduction, Glossators, Grammarians, Moralists and Characteristics).—3. Bibliographica (with the subdivisions: determination of dates given in Hebrew books or MSS.; collections and lists of books; printers and publications in Mantua,1476-1662; printing offices in Prague, and annals of Hebrew typography in Prague, 1513–1657).—4. The memorial of the righteous.—5. The Jewish poets of Provence.—6. History of the Jews in Sicily.—7. Numismatics. But it would be a mistake to think that this table gives an adequate idea of the treasures which are stored up in this work. Thus, for instance, the introductory chapter contains almost a complete list of the names of Christian scholars who wrote works either on or against the Rabbinic literature (7-17).

The essay on the Tosafists, dry as it may look, became the basis of such works as Neubauer's *Les Rabbins Français*, S. Kohn's *Mordechai ben Hillel* (Breslau, 1878), Gross' Essays on different rabbis from the Franco-German school,[116] and many others. The paragraph bearing the unassuming title Char-

acteristics (157-213) contains, besides a *resumé* of the literary activity of these Franco-German schools (157–167), also an account of the life and morals of the Jews in these countries during the Middle Ages. Among other subjects such as their system and the programs of their schools (167-170), the relation of the two sexes, their marriages and the participation of the women in the religious life (171-173), their trades, their pastimes and their amusements (173-175). Their modest way of living, the value of money and the price of various articles (176). Their little acquaintance with natural history and mathematics, their superstitions (177-178). The piety of the German Jews, religion being the centre of their life, who nevertheless has friendly relations with their Christian neighbors by their commerce, visits, and disputations (179-180). Their relation with the priests and the monks and their works (181). The ordinances of the rabbis against luxury, polygamy, etc. (183), the constitution of the communities (184). The titles Rabbi, *Haber*, etc., and the ordination (186); and many other subjects of a similar nature.

Certainly all these subjects are only slightly handled. But the hints here given were taken up, among others, by Güdemann, in whose hands they expanded into three volumes forming his *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Kultur der Juden.* Lastly, we shall mention the paragraphs "The memory of the righteous" (304-317), from which heading one would hardly guess that, besides the lists of abbreviations, the following subjects are in addition treated: the eschatology of Judaism, especially the

opinions of Jewish authors concerning salvation of the Gentiles (371-387); the histories of Jewish cemeteries (390–395); cemeteries and tombstones destroyed by Christians (395-401); collections of epitaphs by various scholars; the cemeteries and epitaphs which are most important from a historical point (402-421); explanations of some pedigrees of celebrated families in Germany and in Spain (421–441).[117]

APPENDIX C

Brief Analysis of the Ritus and Synagogale Poesie

It is the *Ritus* we have to consult for the fixing of the original prayers (*Stammgebete*) in the times of the Geonim, the *Minhag* (custom) that counterbalances this fixing, the difference between the Jews in the East (Babylon) and those in the West (Palestine) concerning the liturgy (1-2), and also the reading of the Law (3); the importance of the *Minhag* that maintains itself in spite of the protest of the authorities; the *Minhag* influenced by the notions of the different countries where the Jews were scattered (4); the two main *Minhagim* with regard to the liturgy, the Arabic *Minhag* (*Minhag Sepharad*) and the Palestinian *Minhag* (*Minhag Ashkenaz*), and their subdivisions (6); some specimens of these differences (7-14); references in the Responsa and works of the Geonim and their activity in this respect (15,16,17; comp. 184, *seq.*); the compilers of first prayer-books (*Siddurim*,18) and the *Mahzorim* (20); compilers of the works concerning the *Minhagim* (21); the commentators of the *Siddur* or the prayer-book (22, 23; see also below, 37); the influence of mysticism on the liturgy (24); books concerning liturgical questions (25—32; see also below, 35); the price of prayer-books and their size (33-34).

The correspondence between the original prayers in the different rites, the differences confining themselves chiefly to the *Piyyutim* (38); short descriptions of the different rites of the Arabic branch (39-59), and of those of the Palestinian branch (60-85); correspond-

ence between the different rites, besides the original prayers (86-97); the days of penitence and fasting in the different countries, and *Selihot* (penitential prayers) recited on those days (117-139); the cause for omitting or altering certain *Piyyutim* (139-156); the Karaitic rite (157-162); the attacks on and the defence of the *Piyyutim* (162–178).

In general we might regard the *Ritus* with the outlines of the external history of the Jewish liturgy as a kind of introduction to the *Synagogale Poesie* (though this appeared earlier), which treats more of the internal history. Here we have to look for the natural development of the Piyyut and the Selihah from the Psalms and the exhortations of the Prophets (1-8), the historical basis of the Piyyutim in the sufferings of Israel; short list of these sufferings up to 1544 (9-58);[118] the state of the liturgy in the beginning of the Middle Ages (59); the cause that led to the rise of the Piyyut (60); the oldest additions to the original prayers (61), consisting in the *Yozer*, *Ofan*, and *Zulat* (62), and their characteristics; the description of the later *Meorah* and *Ahabah* and of the still later paitanic additions to the *Nishmat* (63-64); the *Keroba*, additions to the proper *Tefillah* and the additions to the *Ma'arib* on festival eves (65-69).

The *Piyyutim* on other occasions (70); the paitanic lamentations for the ninth of Ab by Kalir, his *Kerobot* for Purim (72); the paitanic compositions describing the death of Moses; the *Piyyutim* for the Hoshana-day and specimens in a German translation (73-76); the oldest addition to the original prayers for the Day of Atonement, the New Year, and the days

between the former and the latter (77-83); the *Selihah* (especially used in the days before and after the New Year), and description of its various compositions, the metre and the rhyme, etc., its employing of new words (85–125; see also 215).

The further development of the *Piyyut*; its elaborations of talmudical material, sometimes Halakah, but chiefly Haggadah (127); the prayers in the *Piyyut* (129); the five different kinds of the *Selihah* (135–151; see especially 139–144); the development of the legend of the ten martyrs; (144-151) the influence of mysticism on the *Piyyut*; the authors of the *Selihah* of the various countries, with specimens of their compositions in German translations (152-334), and the Piyyut after 1544; continuation of the list of the sufferings in this new time up to the year 1757 (335-355), and the Paitanim of this period (356-363). The twenty-six appendices which follow are mostly on the new grammatical forms created by the Paitanim, their peculiar language and style and the metaphors employed by them when alluding to Israel or its persecutors, the Gentiles.

APPENDIX D

The library of Dr. Zunz was bought by the trustees of the Judith College in Ramsgate. But this collection does not include Zunz's copies of his own works with the author's annotations, corrections, and additions. These are now the property of the *Zunz-Stiftung*, Berlin. Its courteous president was kind enough to lend me these writings of Zunz for five weeks.

The books which were sent to me from Berlin are: the *Zeitschrift*, the *Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge*, the *Ritus*, the just-mentioned *Synagogale Poesie* and the *Zur Geschichte.* The *Literaturgeschichte*, and the *Gesammelte Schriften*, contain probably no additions.

The last note which Zunz made seems to be the rather curious words on the fly leaf of the *Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters*: "Ist 1855, 2 Maerz erschienen, das ist mehr als 207 tausend Stunden vor der Sonntags-Beilage vom 6 Oktober 1878."

In the *Zeitschrift* the two articles by Zunz: *Ueber die in den hebräisch-jüdischen Schriften vorkommenden hispanischen Ortsnamen* (114) and *Salomon ben Isaac, genannt Raschi* (272), are both interleaved, and the additions and corrections to the latter entirely confirm Zunz's statement that he thoroughly revised it. It is superfluous to say that these notes and corrections are of the greatest importance and would add much to our knowledge of Rashi. But it must be remarked that it does not seem that Zunz (though there is on page 326 a reference to the *Orient*, 1849) in later years earnestly thought of

rewriting this essay. Otherwise we could not explain the fact of his having neglected to correct the assertion that the author of the Yosippon was a French Jew, an opinion which he gave up in the *Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge* (150).

This last-mentioned works, the *Zur Geschichte*, the *Ritus*, and the *Synagogale Poesie* are not interleaved, but they are full of corrections and additions on the margin and also between the lines written in a very small hand. Besides there exist three small note-books containing remarks relating to the subjects of these books. We have copied many of them[119] and hope to publish them when this essay will appear in print. Here we give only a few specimens of a more general character, as they may be understood without the text in hand to which they refer.

As may be expected, it was the *Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge* that Zunz cared most to correct and to complete. And there is no doubt that these corrections are indispensable for a new edition of the *G. V.* To give only one instance: Note d on page 57 contains an important statement in the name of the Amora Mar Samuel, but Zunz fails to give us the reference to it. The correction to this note runs as follows: "Jer. Berachoth c. 2. f. 12a. Von ähnlichen nur temporären Halachoth s. Baba Kama 94b and Tos. ibid. Vgl. ליה כללין דרבי כללין Jer. Theruma 1 f. 4a, המנהג מבטל את ההלכה Jer. Baba Mezia 1. f." Such notes abound in hundreds. The Patristic literature also receives some attention. To the list of manuscripts on page 482 twenty nine *codices* are added; p. 48, the existence of the Mekilta of R. Simon ben Johai is accepted,

a fact which is now proved beyond doubt, and in the same way many other points are corrected.

But still we cannot say that even these corrections and additions bring up the *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* to the present level of our knowledge.[120] We could not find in all these posthumous writings reference to the *Beth ha-Midrash* of Jellinek in, which many of the Midrashim known to Zunz only from quotations or manuscripts are now edited. There is also no allusion to Buber's edition of the Pesikta, which at any rate makes the greatest part of chapter 11 superfluous. The statements about Kalir (318 *seq.*) were also left uncorrected. But in the reference we gave in note [111], we have ample evidence that Zunz did alter his opinion with regard to the age and country of Kalir. That he gave up the belief in גימטריאות is also certain, and the testimony of Luzzatto (see the reference in note 18) gains additional strength the following MS. note of Zunz in the *Zur Geschichte*, p. 126: "Landauer (Orient 1845 No. 36) macht ihn zum Verfasser des vierten Gesanges ארומם אלהי אבי; er unterstützt diese Meinung mit גימטריאות!" The exclamation mark is by Zunz.

In a long note again containing a refutation of ראבי"ה Zunz tries to maintain his view concerning the נתן מ"ט מדות דר', which cannot be maintained any longer since the edition of this Baraita (see note 33). In a remark on page 405 relating to the Zohar-question we find the following characteristic words: "Beweise bei מטפחת ספרים, בחינת הדת ארי נוהם MS. Reggio hinter בחינת הדת und zu ארי נוהם MS. Die stärksten Beweise schlummern noch

bei Rapoport und *mir.*" But as these "Beweise" are still *schlummernd* nothing remains to the future editor of the *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* but to refer to Landauer, Jellinek and Graetz. We could add many more instances of this kind, but the few we have given suffice to show that the *Gottedienstliche Vorträge* cannot be edited without a thorough revision, though these MS. additions and corrections will prove of great use to the editor.

Of much more importance, even, we think the many MS. notes to the *Synagogale Poesie*, *Ritus*, and the *Zur Geschichte.* There is no hope that these books will ever find a devoted editor[121], and the additions to the content of these works by the successors of Zunz correct him very little. Every note, therefore, which Zunz left us is of the greatest value and ought to be edited by the *Zunz-Stiftung.* We might perhaps remark here that this part of the *Zur Geschichte* concerning the printing-offices and the publications in Prague and Mantua, which was so violently attacked by the reviewer in the *Orient* (see note 117) is thoroughly corrected in the manuscripts.

We have been speaking of Caro's Hebrew translation of the *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge.*[122] With regard to this translation we find in the flyleaf of the *G. V.* the following note: Nachschrift des David Caro:

„הפעם אודה ה' בלב שלם וברוח קדושה כי החייני עד הנה להשלים העתקת הספר היקר הזה אשר אין דוגמתו בכי טוב יום שלישי פרשת וישב כ"א כסלו תקצ"ד (1833 3.Dezember) אחר החילותי מעשי מש"ק פ' עקב תקצ"ב (1833 18. August) זה הים הגדול אשר הגיתי בו זה ימים האלה האירו עיני בתורת ה' והלהיבו רוחי,

לעבודת ה'; רוח נכונה וטהורה לכבוד אלהי ישראל ותורתו מרחפת על פני כל הספר וישיחו בו יושבי באהלי ביהמ"ד.

To this Zunz adds: "Meine Revision der Uebersetzung beendigt 1835 7. April Dienstag (ח' ניסן) Nachmittag halb 6."

Of Zunz's relation to other scholars the following note on one ofthe fly leaves of the *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* is very characteristic: "Dr. Formstecher: über Israels Gottes-Verehrung (in Adler's *Synagoge*, II, Heft 2, 87-107) ist, wie auch bemerkt wird, hauptsächlich aus meinem Buche geschöpft. Ewald, Gesch. der Israeliten, benutzt meine Forschungen über die Chronik, sagt es aber nicht; vgl. die Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft, Berlin 1845, III, 567.— הגדה Königsberg 1845, 2 Ausgabe schreibt Samuel Meklenburg mich aus (*Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, 126 f) Edelmann nennt mich nicht; מבוא התלמוד von Chajes, Lemberg 1845 in 4., אגרת בקרת wo dasselbe geschieht. Vgl. Th. 6 S 265, 256. *Sidur*, von Landshut u. Edelmann, Königsberg bei Samter, 1846 in 8. benutzt mich S 36 f über die Gebete."

Of his resentment against isolating Jewish literature the following MS. note may serve as an example: "Hupfeld hat von diesem meinem Buche nichts gewusst als er seinen Artikel schrieb in de antiq. Scriptor. accentuum (1847) part 2 p. 11, ff., daher heisst wohl im Katolog seiner Bibliothek mein Buch: "Zur Geschichte und Literatur *der Juden.*"!

Many other notes of a similar character are to be found in this posthumous writing, but as we think to enlarge our essay in every respect we must satisfy ourselves with the few we have given here.

We will only add one more MS. note occurring on the margin of the *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* p. 385 which is characteristic by reason of his estimation of the Piyyutim: "Ang. Mai, Classicorum Auctorum Tom V p. 479-500 *Hisperica Famina* in seltsamer und abnormer Latinität prosaisches Gedicht mannigfaltigen Inhalts, dessen Verfasser selber 12 Arten Latinität annimmt— als höre man einen Paitan! (v. Allgemeine Lit. Z. 1836 Mai. f. Bl. N. 50) wimmelnd von ungewöhnlichen, barbarischen griechischen u. neugebildeten Wörtern. Die in der Sammlung vorhergehenden Stücke sind meist aus dem 8 u. 9 Jahrhundert".

About Zunz's claim to keep the office of a rabbi we have to state here on the authority of Dr. Neumann that he had his התרת הוראה from the famous rabbi Aaron Choriner.

Of his devotion to his wife the following passage from a letter by Zunz, in which he thanks the president of the *Zunz-Stiftung* for his attention, gives evidence: "Diese auf mich eindringende Fluth von Theilnahme u. Liebe, die unter der Gestalt der Anerkennung auftrat, hat mich innig gerührt, hoch erfreut, und das nicht zum kleinsten Theile meines teuren Weibes, meiner geliebten Adelheid wegen, die nun 42 Jahre in Freud und Leid meine Stütze und Helferin ist, deren Einsicht, Edelsinn und Genügsamkeit ich mit verschuldet bin, wenn ich die bisherigen Lebensjahre der Wissenschaft zu weihen im Stande gewesen."

The letter is dated Berlin, August the 16th, 1864.

We have also to thank Dr. Neumann for a copy of the epitaphs of Zunz and his wife; we give them here:

I Vorderseite

פ"נ
האשה היקרה והאהובה
מרת אידל
בת ר' ליב בערמן
אשת מו"ה יום טוב ליפמן צונץ
נאספה אל עמה
בת שבעים ושתים שנה
יום ג' ה' אלול ה'ת'ר'ל'ד'

II. Hinterseite.

Hier ruht
ADELHEID ZUNZ
geb. Bermann aus Pyrmont
geboren am 2 April 1802-5562
gestorben am 18 August 1874-5634

I. Vorderseite

איש מופת יחיד בדורו, עיני העדה
האיר באורו לו כל חמדת ישראל
הוא היה אבי יושב אהל, ראש
החוקרים בקדמוניות ישרון, החכם
הישיש גדול מרבן שמו
יום טוב ליפמן צונץ
נאסף אל עמו בן תשעים ושנים שנה
יום ד' י' אדר שני ה' ת'ר'מ'ו'
ויובל לקברות ביום א' י"ד לחדש
ויום הפורים נהפך מיום טוב לאבל
והמשכילים יזהרו כזהר הרקיע
ומצדיקי הרבים ככוכבים לעולם ועד

II. Hinterseite

Hier ruht
DR. LEOPOLD ZUNZ
geboren zu Detmold
am 10ten August 1794
gestorben am 17 März 1886.

ON THE STUDY OF THE TALMUD

The object of this article is to show how little progress has been made in the modern study of the Talmud, to suggest some of the unavoidable causes of this lack of progress, and to indicate in some measure that, great as are the inherent difficulties of this study, they are too frequently aggravated by the ignorant, unscientific, or prejudiced treatment to which the Talmud is subjected.

Notwithstanding the widespread tendency towards minute philological investigation which has characterized the last half century, resulting in vastly increased knowledge not only of the ancient forms of Indo-Teutonic speech, but of most other languages, living and dead, and, notwithstanding the omnivorous character of the science itself, modern philology has done but little, so far, for the study and elucidation of the Rabbinical classics. We say modern philology advisedly, bearing in mind the loyal accuracy, the dispassionate criticism, and the indefatigable researches which have raised the methods of the true philologist to a level with those of the exact sciences.

Of work—of a kind—upon the Talmud there has been plenty, and to spare. Of this we shall treat later. But of real, honest study and scientific criticism there has been comparatively little. At first sight this might well seem strange, and even inexplicable. It might seem strange that important por-

tions of the literature of that people to which the world of civilization owes so much of its spiritual life, precisely as to the Greeks it owes so much of its intellectual life, should remain as little known as the literature of China, or should absorb even less interest than the Cuneiform inscriptions. That the literature of the Jews should occupy a lower place in the consideration of the Western peoples than does the Sanscrit or the Pali, might well be wondered at. But this is the case, and it would be no exaggeration to say that for every Englishman who has read a line of the Talmud there are ten who have read the Rig-veda.

Yet to complain of this neglect is not our purpose. Indeed, much as we regret it, we cannot but admit it is in many respects intelligible. The difficulties which beset the proper study of the Talmud are very great, very numerous, and very varied. These difficulties are both internal and external.

The internal difficulties arising from the history, form, and character of the work are calculated to terrify all but the most indomitable. The mere preliminary question with which Deutsch began his brilliant, though one-sided article, seventeen years ago: "What is the Talmud?" is impossible to answer. Deutsch did not attempt to answer it, nor shall we. The Talmud is a work too varied, too disconnected, and too divergent in its elements to be concisely defined at all or to be even approximately described within the limits of an English sentence.

It is easier to say what the Talmud is not than

what it is. Yet so little is popularly known of its character and composition that it is necessary to say a few preliminary words in regard to these points, if only to make the use of two or three indispensable technical terms generally intelligible. This much, at all events, it may be useful to state as to the so-called divisions of the Talmud to which reference is frequently made. One is a physical division in form; the other a clasification of substance represented by the words "Halakah" and "Haggadah". From one point of view the Talmud may somewhat loosely be said to consist of the "Mishnah" and the "Gemara". The former is the ill-arranged[1] transcript of one version of the "Oral Law", in the narrower sense of the word, and is a book of no very considerable size. It was drawn up in its present form, though not written down, about 200 C. E. The Gemara may be roughly described as a sort of gigantic commentary on the Mishnah, but it is a commentary enormous portions of which have absolutely nothing to do with the text on which it comments. Yet one main business of the Gemara is the elucidation and development of that oral law which comprised within its view all sides of human life, and not merely affairs of ritual or of faith. We are there presented with interminable legal discussions, not elaborated for us into polished phrases, but simply the raw material itself fresh from the Rabbis and their schools. Intermingled with these legal discussions there is a vast amount of theological data and suggestions, and, since all Hebrew Law rests upon the Pentateuch, there is found room for interpretations of Scripture of the most

different kinds—ingenious or clumsy, grotesque or beautiful, as the case may be.

Moreover, these very interpretations and citations of Scripture lead on to all kinds of remarks, stories, and allusions in regard to any other religious or secular subject which the quoted passage may chance to call up to the mind of the speaker or reporter. That the thread of the argument, or the course of the "commentary", is interrupted by these excursions is not of the least consequence. Form was not a consideration, and obviously according to this method, or want of method, there was room for the work to expand indefinitely. For it was not written all at once, or with a defined object: it simply grew. It was not a building but a conglomerate. And as the various sides of the Law are successively handled, any stray point connected with any particular law may be dwelt upon and illustrated at a length totally disproportionate to its importance.

Thus the Talmud is full of fragmentary notices relating to almost every subject under the heavens, and much of this varied material of statement and story is the offshoot of the book's main object—the practical working out of the religious life as manifested in all branches of human conduct. This practical or legal part is called the Halakah (literally "Rule"). But opposed to the Halakah, and yet often inextricably connected with or issuing from it, is the other great side of the Talmud, which is called by the name of Haggadah. The outward manifestation of religion in life was regulated by a series of minute laws and observances; but if no divergency was here permitted—for though individ-

uals may argue differently, they are in practice compelled to follow either the majority, or the one particular authority whose prestige excels that of the majority —in the field of religious imagination the widest license was freely allowed. One object of the Talmud is to record the mass of floating stories and parables, legends and miracles, which formed a large part of the real religious food and sustenance of rabbinical Judaism. This heterogeneous mass is the Haggadah. Where the Mishnah in any way lends itself to Haggadic treatment, the Gemara becomes sometimes more haggadic than halakic. In other portions of the Gemara there is very little haggadic matter, but often on the slightest provocation this element suddenly reappears, and once fairly started it flows on irrepressibly. It will consequently be readily realized that these two elements in the Talmud are not clearly separated in the text, but are often closely interwoven and blended with each other.

Now, still evading the insoluble question "What is the Talmud?", let us glance at what we know of its history and how it grew into existence in the form in which it is presented to us. The completed Talmud is the outcome of a long course of transcription, which however, did not begin till the second part of the fourth century C. E. Previous to that time, the prohibition against committing to writing the teaching handed down by tradition was still in force.[2]

Of what, then, did this prolonged work of transcription consist? It was not a case where an editor or editors had merely to collect matter already written, and, after due comparison and collation of the whole,

to arrange and edit it on a given principle. There was, in fact, no editing, for there was nothing to edit.[3] From first to last it was almost exclusively a matter of reducing to writing what up till then had been carried by memory and handed down by oral tradition. And the so-called editors had no material save the oral communications made to them from various sources.[4] This circumstance would obviously defeat the possibilities of exhaustive arrangement or elaborated method. The oral communications referred to were received successively and not in parallel relation to one another; they were written down as they came, that is, they were compiled, not edited.

The probability is that even this unsystematic compilation was due not to deliberate plan, but to necessity. The continuous and ever-growing stream of oral doctrine, flowing and swelling in volume through centuries, had at last begun to exceed the powers of human memory, and recourse to transcription became inevitable. A teacher, one Rab Ashi, who worked in the latter half of the fourth century, is said to have resolved to collect the material. Whether he ever began to commit it to writing is very doubtful. It is certain that neither he nor his immediate successors accomplished this undertaking, and it is equally certain that neither he nor they confined themselves entirely to the work of collection. They were editors and authors at one and the same time.

But the shape in which the Talmud is now presented to us as a completed entirety—if we are justified in so speaking of it—was not attained until the end of the eighth century.[5] Now here we find, at once, one great

difficulty in the study of the Talmud, namely, the utter want of form, of continuity, of connected method, of even verbal consistency. It is, moreover, clear that parts of this voluminous text, carried in the memory and orally transmitted for centuries, must have suffered alteration, injury, and mutilation in the process. When we recollect that there was absolutely no aid to memory in the nature of the material, is it credible that such a chaotic pile of matter could, under the conditions, escape this fate?[6]

The language of the Talmud lacks every phonetic advantage. One passage does not naturally suggest the next, and the context often helps us little. There is no metre and no rhythm. Now these defects, while [not] calculated to impair the fidelity of the written Talmud, render its study difficult and sometimes bewildering to the point of exasperation. The Jews of olden times were wont to speak of the Talmud as *Yam ha-Talmud*, the "sea of the Talmud." And the figure has much force. To one who has grasped its meaning and felt its spirit there is the ocean-like sense of immensity and movement. Its great broad surface is at times smooth and calm, at other times disturbed by breakers of discussion, stormy with question and answer, assertion and refutation. Its waves of argument, as they follow and tumble over one another, all give a constant sense of largeness and of motion. And, to continue the figure, we find the sea fed by innumerable brooks and mighty rivers of traditional lore: we remember that these sources ran not through unbroken country but through bad [spaces] and good, so that it were little wonder if, on the

one hand, some of them lost volume on the way, and, on the other, some of their streams were defiled and corrupted by foreign elements gathered in their course and borne into this great sea.

If it is probable that the text of the Talmud, as we have it, suffered from the delay in beginning transcription, it is not less probable that it suffered similarly during the extended period which the completion of that transcription occupied. This period extended over about four centuries. The delay was not, however, due to the great care and scrupulous precautions which were expended upon the work. It must rather be attributed to the unfortunate condition of the people and to the troublous times which often interrupted the labors of the scribes. There were, during this space of time, whole periods in which, owing to the bitter religious persecutions and to political disquietude, the study of the Law entirely ceased and neither teachers nor scholars remained. The work was certainly again taken in hand as soon as circumstances were more favorable, but there is little doubt that, owing to the interruptions referred to above, any attempt at a uniform plan, if such were ever contemplated, must have been defeated and abandoned.

It will thus be readily believed that a work of this magnitude, with such a history and of such a character, must present considerable difficulties to the systematic and conscientious student. That after centuries of residence in the fallible memories of men, followed by centuries of unmethodic and interrupted compilations, there should be inconsistencies and

contradictions in the resulting whole, was inevitable. Thus we find one rabbi assigning to his own master a particular opinion on a particular subject, while in another passage another rabbi credits the same authority with precisely the opposite view.[7] That errors found their way into the text was equally inevitable;[8] that matter was lost or misplaced, that some texts were accidentally mutilated or misunderstood,[9] and that others were wilfully and maliciously distorted is tolerably certain. These defects give rise to doubts and obscurities, in dealing with which neither textual criticism nor philological acumen is of much help, for all other sources of the older Rabbinical literature which might be consulted suffer from similar blemishes.[10]

The foregoing list of difficulties will probably justify us before our readers when we say that a definite verdict on the merits or demerits of the Talmud as a whole is an impossibility. Such a verdict were inconceivable, even supposing that the Talmud had been most systematically compiled, and that we were in possession of the most desirable certainty with regard to its sources. Even a question put in the form "How does the Talmud think on this or that subject?" is inappropriate. For how can a true answer to such a question be gathered from a work which does not reproduce the system of any given man or any given school, but is, as already stated, a mere collection of sayings, statements, discussions, views, reminiscences and stories flowing from some four to five hundred rabbis, and embracing a period of more than eight hundred years? In the course of those

centuries the Jewish people experienced so many vicissitudes of fortune, came into contact with so many foreign nations, and passed through so many internal and external convulsions, that the Rabbis, themselves a part of this people and subject to the same influences, must of necessity have felt, thought and spoken variously, at different times, on the same points.

One aim, and one aim only, was common to all Rabbis alike, namely *to do what the law enjoined and to avoid doing what it forbade, and, as far as possible, to render the non-fulfilment of any command and contravention of any prohibition an impossibility.* But on the questions how this great aim should be secured, in what manner that which was enjoined to be done should be done, and how that which should be avoided was to be avoided, opinions widely differed. External influences and individual impressions combined to constitute the varying sayings and teachings of the Rabbis.

It is not, then, the general opinion of the Talmud on any given point for which we must ask, but the opinions of the particular Rabbis, and we must always be prepared to find the affirmation of one met by the direct negative of another. Thus, to go one step farther, it would not be profitable to ask whether the Rabbis as a body are tolerant or intolerant. Though the majority were probably what we should now call intolerant, it is obvious that in the course of so many centuries and in the midst of such changes of fortune their attitude towards other races and creeds could not have remained unchanged.

Is there any record of a people retaining through centuries the same collective attitude towards a single

subject? The adage *autres temps autres moeurs* was probably as true of the Jews in the first half dozen centuries after Christ as of any other people during a similar period of its history. The Jews undoubtedly had their moments of wild excitement and frenzied indignation. The same false and exaggerated patriotism that bade the noblest of the *Freiheits-Dichter* in German exclaim "Nieder mit den Wälschen," extorted from the Rabbis the words: "Slaughter the best of the Gentiles [in time of war]."[10a] And the same impulses which in Europe led to acts of vandalism, "judicial murders", and fanatical cruelty, prompted the powerless Rabbis—with, perhaps, even better justification[11]—to speak of the Gentile world with that contempt and hatred which is too frequently disclosed by the Talmud. But in the same Talmud we find that in happier times Jewish Rabbis had Gentile friends, whose death they lamented with the words: "Woe to the bond which is broken,"[12] and that other Rabbis were keenly alive to the art and intellect of Hellas.[13]

In dealing with an unwieldy and amorphous mass of material like the Talmud, a familiar method of procedure consists in separately abstracting all matters connected with a special subject and systematizing it. The whole work is thus gradually absorbed and utilized in a series of monographs. We should accordingly proceed to deduce "The Theology of the Talmud," "The Philosophy of the Talmud," and so on. The method is a valuable one, and often affords the best form of assistance to subsequent students of the same matter. But in order that it should be used successfully, it is necessary that the facts should exist before

the theory. This unhappily is not the case with the Talmud, which thus does not lend itself to this plan of treatment. What might be called the "operative part" of the Talmud—the legal discussions and ordinances which compose the Halakah—was always approached by the Rabbis with deliberation and care.

But all the vague imaginings on metaphysical and theological questions which incidentally occur in the course of discussion or story are little more than the outcome of the individual fancy and natural bent of the several teachers. On this side of their work they allow themselves almost unrestrained latitude. Any attempt to construct a series of systems—say of Rabbinical theology or Rabbinical philosophy—upon their unconnected, and we might almost say irresponsible utterances, can only be misleading. What there is of speculation concerning the nature of God, of His wisdom and justice in governing the world, and so on, was in no wise the result of profound and continuous thought. The various ideas were not in any case the issue of careful trains of reasoning on the part of a single Rabbi, still less were they the conclusions of a school. They were the mere *obiter dicta* of individual Rabbis, momentary inspirations, products of imagination rather than of reason. The wide range of anthropomorphic figure applied to descriptions of the Deity—from a destroying warrior to a master of dialectic—suggests how unrestrained was the play of fancy in which the Rabbis indulged.

So again in Ta'anit 25a we are told that a Rabbi Levi, in a time of great drought, complained that God behaved as a careless father who had no

compassion on his children. Another Rabbi, when rain had been granted in exact accord with the wishes of the people, spoke of God as an indulgent Father who could not refuse His spoiled children a single boon (*ibid.* 23a). But the Talmud is wholly unaware of any radical difference in these two views of God, and their authors were not giving vent to the convictions of a system, but to the casual feelings of the moment. The inferences from the facts as to the nature of God were as simple as the facts themselves; they were not meant to be applied beyond the occasions on which they were used. Each case stood by itself, and it would never have occurred to the compilers of *Ta'anit* that a theory was needed whereby the apparent inconsistency might be reconciled. We may here add incidentally that, on the whole, the old Rabbinic way of regarding the Deity may fairly be described as at once childish and child-like. We say, "on the whole," because there is in places evidence of higher and more intellectual conceptions.[14]

What we have said as to theological questions may be said with equal correctness of the philosophy of the Talmud. There is *no* philosophy of the Talmud, but only scattered and varied notions on philosophical questions risked by individual Rabbis. Here and there a Rabbi lighted on a philosophical idea, he knew not how; but he delivered himself of it in all innocence, and passed on. It never occurred to one of them to follow up such an idea to its conclusions. They were in no sense formal philosophers, but they talked so much *de omnibus rebus* that they could hardly escape touching, even though unconsciously, on philosophy.

Just as it is easier to say what the Talmud is not than what it is, so, it will be seen, is it easier to say how it may not, than how it may, be studied. We might easily multiply instances, such as we have just given, of this difficulty, each one presenting a pitfall into which unwary or injudicious writers on the subject have already fallen. But we have said enough of the internal difficulties. We have now to contemplate those which are not inherent in the work itself. These are both negative and positive. The former difficulties amount to this: that, for a work of surpassing intricacy, there is practically no outside assistance. The latter are roughly represented by the unscientific treatment of which the Talmud has been a victim. We suffer, in other words, from a lack of good guides and from a surfeit of misleading ones.

We have suggested how the text must have suffered in its early stages of oral transmission and prolonged compilation. It fared still worse after it had been compiled. In the Middle Ages it was not only confiscated and burnt by papal authority, but it was mutilated and tortured by a fanatical and ignorant censorship, which not unfrequently disfigured its most harmless passages.[15] But if, in approaching the study of a text as confused and obscure as that of the Talmud, we turn for help to those friends and guides familiar to us in the study of other ancient texts—Latin, Greek, and Sanscrit—we turn in vain. Scientific study of the Talmud is of very recent date, being hardly more than half a century old. We are indeed greatly indebted to the gigantic labors of the Spanish and Franco-German schools of

the Middle Ages.[16] But what they have left us was the work of devout Jews, whose treatment of the subject was not only very unlike the scientific method of modern research, but lacked that preliminary scepticism which is rightly held as essential to honest inquiry. These writers, though profound and serious investigators, were also profound and serious believers, and were therefore incapable of using the scalpel of criticism upon what was, in part, their religious code.[17] But true science, as is now acknowledged, which looks not *at* things but *into*, and if possible *behind*, things, requires this unflinching procedure.[18]

It was not till the third decade of the present century that any real critical study of the Talmud was commenced. And even now the work is but begun. We are not unmindful of, nor ungrateful for, the splendid labors of Rapoport, Krochmal, Zunz, Frankel, Geiger, and many other earnest and honest investigators. These writers, endowed with a wide and varied knowledge and gifted with a profound historical interest as well as accurate philological tact, subjected the Talmud and its kindred literature to a new criticism. They sought to unravel difficulties and to solve problems which were themselves the product of a hitherto unheard-of scepticism. They began to dig out the buried sources, to compare individual parts of the Talmud with each other, and to bring within the sphere of their researches whole portions to which, up to that time, very little attention had been paid. They introduced the critical study of manuscripts, in order, so far as possible, to trace the historical development of this stupendous work

from its origin to its conclusion. In consequence of the surprising results of their investigations, which very soon attracted the attention of the Jewish literary world, they gradually succeeded in starting a school of disciples who sought to continue the new inquiries in the spirit of their masters.[19]

The world is indebted to the illustrious men to whom we have here referred and to their school, but so immense is the field and so few are the workers that we are still justified in saying that to the complete study of the Talmud there is but fragmentary assistance to hand.

For centuries the literature of Greece and Rome has been the main study of a hundred universities. Patient, loving students have devoted their lives to the elucidation of fragments of this lore, and the results of their labors have passed into the hands of succeeding generations who have added new stores of knowledge to the large in-gatherings of the past. Aided by the authority of a powerful church, the encouragement of princes, and the endowments of the wealthy, classical learning has grown and extended till there is hardly a single incident in the history of any little township in ancient Hellas which we may not find faithfully portrayed for us with all its local and contemporary surroundings, and portrayed, moreover, without bias or passion, but simply as the issue of cold, calm investigation.

But for the Hebrew literature there has been none of this wealth of interest and labor. The Talmud has never yet been systematically taught and expounded in the lecture rooms of European universities; its study is

practically confined to the Jews, who have neither scholarships nor pensions to bestow upon impecunious inquirers. Thus, very naturally, the number of devoted laborers demanded by such an immense and neglected province is not forthcoming. And owing to the fact that the number of workers in the whole field of Jewish literature is so limited, and that many of these are occupied with post-Talmudic writings, there exists a want of even those most necessary resources which in every literary investigation compose the scientific apparatus.

There is still wanting an exhaustive grammar of the Talmudic idiom, a grammar which should not merely help the student over his declensions and conjugations, but which should furnish critical information as to the whole structure of the language and its frequent doubtful constructions.[20] There exists at present no complete dictionary on a level with the famous Liddell and Scott, which we might confidently take as a guide to the elucidation of that Babel of tongues which have found their way into the Talmud.[21] We have no complete and trustworthy indexes and concordances of names and subjects.[22] There is a wretched paucity of good monographs relating either to the most prominent Rabbis or to the many archaeological puzzles which were scattered through the text. Lastly, there are no complete translations of the Talmud extant which could be consulted as to obscure passages.[23]

In other branches of ancient literature there is scarcely a single work of which the manuscripts from the earliest copy downward have not been utilized and investigated for the purpose of establishing a fixed

and definite text. It is not without a pang of envy that the student of the Talmud regards those beautiful editions of the classics, with their revised texts, their critical and explanatory notes, and their voluminous references, carefully elaborated to meet the requirements of modern philology. Here, at all events so far as it lies in human power, man has performed his duty to truth.

But in the case of the Talmud things are very different. Neither of the haggadic nor yet of the halakic part of the Talmud do we possess even in the present day a text corrected according to the best manuscripts, and collated with the earliest editions. The want of such revised editions of the old Rabbinical literature was bitterly lamented by the famous German Orientalist, Lagarde, in his preface to the *Clementina*, edited by him nineteen years ago; "a dilettante handling of these texts" has only led to misconceptions.[24] It is true that much has been done since Lagarde wrote his preface, but it is a miserably small amount in comparison with that which yet remains to be achieved.[25]

Enough, perhaps, has been said of the difficulties to satisfy our readers that the way is long and steep and with but few trustworthy sign-posts. Unhappily, it is beset with many dangers and snares—false sign-posts and misleading lights. If, as a field of inquiry, the Talmud were virgin soil, it were an easier task to master it than it is. The greatest stumbling-block to its study is the pernicious way in which that study has hitherto been pursued. We complain, not so much of the neglect from which it has suffered, as of

the attention of the wrong sort which it has received, not so much of the injury of being ignored as of ignorant handling. For, in truth, if the Talmud was burnt and disfigured in the flesh by the medieval censor, it is tortured and mutilated in the spirit by many a modern writer. The object of the remainder of this article is to protest against, and to some extent to illustrate, the manner in which the Talmud has been used or misused for every purpose except that of honest, dispassionate, and scientific inquiry. It has been praised and decried, equally without reason; it has been the victim of enthusiasts kindly and unkindly[26]—

"So overviolent or overcivil,
That every man with them is God or devil."

The exaggerated praise of Deutsch and the other panegyrists is just as revolting to the critical sense as is the unmeasured abuse of Eisenmenger and his school. Thus, according to some writers, so Christian is the tendency of the Talmud, that it is hard to say why the Rabbis were not long ago canonized *en bloc*. According to others, it is so anti-Christian, that we wonder a good Christian like Reuchlin should have read it in all seeming unconsciousness of the fact. To some it is the perfection of the beautiful and good; to others the acme of revolting wickedness and ugliness. Its stories are now deep parables and lovely legends; now they are silly fables, insipid exaggerations. It is now profound and logical; now shallow and soulless; and so forth *ad infinitum*.

Of the numerous writers who had never read a line of the Talmud, and yet have not hesitated to judge it,

we need not say anything here. What we deplore is the extent to which men, with sufficient knowledge and ability to read and understand the Talmud, neither read nor understand it, or read and misunderstand it, or, reading and understanding, misuse it and distort it. Our charge against these writers is that they do not study the Talmud for itself. They do not read it in order to understand it aright, to grasp its real nature, to penetrate to its real being; but they read it for wholly extraneous purposes, to support a theory, to afford illustrations, to prove a case, to supply surprises. To them it is not a museum, but an old curiosity-shop. It does not contain scientific specimens to be respected, but bric-a-brac to be displayed. It is not searched for truth's sake, but rummaged for curios. The belief prevails that touching every subject something may be found in the Talmud. You have only to dig deep enough, and you will find something which will either straightway suit your purpose or which, with a little violence, can be made to serve. Many are the philosophical systems which have been elicited from the Talmud; many the strange ideas which have been ingeniously extracted from it.[27] The authors of these discoveries have usually been actuated by the most amiable motives, but the effects of their perfervid zeal and their naive anachronisms have been none the less disastrous. How much further should we be in our knowledge of the book if these writers could have been induced to study it in the proper way. Much enthusiastic labor directed to idle and foolish ends has been utterly thrown away; the Talmud itself has been continually twisted

and perverted out of all recognition, has been put to every conceivable purpose except the right one.

How different is the treatment accorded to the better known branches of literature. No one dares to pervert or even carelessly to use the texts of any familiar Greek classic. The small chance of detection in the case of the Talmud gives a sense of security to the writers we complain of. They do not risk liberties with texts in which a school-boy may trip them up, but they may say what they like of the Talmud.

Of all works, the Talmud, on account of its internal difficulties, most needs careful, unbiassed, and critical treatment, and of all works it has least received such treatment. To understand the Talmud is a life-long task, to form a comprehensive opinion of it almost an impossibility. And yet otherwise conscientious authors do not scruple to approach it lightly, to excerpt it, and to generalize on it after far less study than they would give to a Latin historian or a Greek philosopher.

All this is not only a loss to the Talmud student: it is a loss to mankind, whose interests are only served by truth.

It is our purpose now to choose, for cursory examination, from a long list of books answering the above description, one which, by reason of the learning, authority, and evident honesty of its author, is calculated to carry unusual weight, and consequently to spread more widely the errors it contains. We are alluding to Dr. Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah.*[28] The book is one eminently de-

signed to attract attention. Not only is the subject one of superlative interest to the educated and religious world, but the evident conviction and fervent faith of the author give it a persuasiveness difficult to resist. The style is for the most part lofty and appropriate, and the whole wears the impression of great erudition and earnestness of purpose. If, therefore, it is also, as we propose to show, a signal example of the manner in which the Talmud is misinterpreted and misapplied, it will be understood that such a book is more than ordinarily calculated to disseminate these errors, and by its very merits to give them a wider currency than need be feared in the case of less powerful productions.

In limine it must be understood that the following remarks are in no sense a review or a critique of the book: they are intended solely to discuss the value and correctness of part of the evidence adduced by Dr. Edersheim, in support of one of his central propositions. A large portion of the book is devoted to asserting or re-asserting the originality of the teachings of Christ, in reply to those writers, Christian and Jewish, who, by a comparison of passages from the Rabbinical literature with passages from the New Testament, have sought to establish a marked connection between the personality of Jesus and the time in which he lived. Dr. Edersheim contends that not only are the doctrines of the Gospel not borrowed from the Rabbis, but are everywhere in glaring opposition to their views, and that where Christian doctrine is most characteristic it is most divergent from Rabbinical teachings.

It is true, "Jesus of Nazareth was a Jew, and moved among Jews" (Preface, viii); but nevertheless in the main point "there is not a difference, but a total divergence" (I,106), "an absolute contrariety," (I, 107), "an infinite distance between Christ and the teachings of the synagogue" (II,15), so that the "Messiah of Judaism is the anti-Christ of the Gospel" (I, 293). And the proof of this result is largely dependent on a use, or rather, as we propose to show, on a misuse of Talmudic quotations. Having once arrived at "this absolute contrariety," Dr. Edersheim deduces therefrom "one of the strongest evidences of the claims of Christ, since it raises the all-important question, whence the teacher of Nazareth had drawn his inspiration" (Preface, ix); or, as Dr. Edersheim expresses himself in another place, "if Jesus was not of God, not the Messiah, whence this wonderful contrast?" (I, 17). We venture to hold that the glory of such a sublime figure as that of Jesus Christ in no wise requires the process adopted in dealing with a microscopic object, namely, the obscuration of its surroundings.

Be that as it may, we are not disposed to discuss with Dr. Edersheim the propriety of a comparison between the teaching of Jesus and that of the Rabbis. Nor shall we investigate Dr. Edersheim's evidence drawn from the New Testament, nor dispute the results at which he arrives. The former belongs to the province of New Testament criticism, the latter is a matter of controversial theology. Whether Dr. Edersheim succeeds or fails in establishing his proposition is not for us to inquire. We have to do

with one part of his evidence only; it is exclusively with his use of the Talmud we are here engaged.

We contend that Dr. Edersheim has not studied exhaustively all the great commentators, especially those whose writings are in Hebrew: that he has not always been sufficiently careful to grasp the real meaning of quoted passages by comparing them with the context; that he has allowed his enthusiasm for his argument to blind him to other passages; that his misapprehension of their utterances has jaundiced his opinion of the Rabbis as a body and individually, and that this effect has reacted so as to color his interpretation of the Talmud. On the whole we maintain that he has too often departed from the attitude of the unbiassed investigator.

In endeavoring to support these charges we warn the reader that we may seem to attach too much importance and to devote too much space to what may appear trifling and subordinate details. But if this be so, it is due to Dr. Edersheim's method. The skeleton of his argument, as well as the matter with which it is filled in, hinges on very numerous quotations from the Rabbinical writings, and not on large questions. It is composed of minutiae depending on one another, and it is some of these which we have to attack, recognizing, as we hope the reader does also, that to some extent the strength of the chain of such an argument is the strength of its weakest link.

A keen controversialist, Dr. Edersheim has a poor opinion of the Rabbis, and treats them as a body with but scant courtesy. When he quotes them—under whatever name, Pharisee, Scribe, Rabbi, or

Sage—his antipathy betrays him into the use of warm language, and he speaks of them as "self-righteous, self-seeking jurists" (vol. I, 185) who are "mad with self-exaltation" (II, 15) and whose doctrines are brimful of "profanity" (I, 113), "superstition" (I, 106), and "self-glory" (I, 136). Their writings are replete with "absurd and silly legends" (I, 254), "foolish, repulsive" (I, 292), even "blasphemous stories" (II, 116), and the like.

It is no part of our work to white-wash the Rabbis. They have survived centuries of even less discriminating opprobrium than the above. Dr. Edersheim will not expect us seriously to criticize the uncomplimentary epithets he applies to the scribes as a body further than to suggest that in a grave and important work such language is out of place. It does not better an argument, and is apt to recall the familiar expedient of the Law Courts: "With a bad case abuse the plaintiff's attorney."

In speaking of individual Rabbis Dr. Edersheim is not more tender. We find, however, one exception to this rule. In Vol. I, 136, a noteworthy passage occurs: "There is much about those earlier Rabbis—Hillel, Gamaliel, and others, to attract us, and their spirit oft-times contrasts with the narrow bigotry, the self-glory, and the unspiritual externalism of their successors."

Now these Rabbis were the contemporaries of Jesus Christ, and we would suggest, *par parenthèse*, that in a work dealing with the life and times of Jesus the utterances of his contemporaries would be of the first importance, notably when that work professes to con-

trast the teachings of the Gospels with those of the contemporary Rabbis. It is perhaps not irrelevant to note here, for what it is worth, that the vast majority of Dr. Edersheim's references to the Talmud are to portions assigned therein to Rabbis who lived not earlier than the second century after Christ.

Later on, however (I, 239), Dr. Edersheim seems disposed to modify his opinion of Hillel, and this for the drollest of reasons. Because Dr. Edersheim holds that the school of Shammai was more national in its aspirations than that of Hillel, he finds it necessary to depreciate the personal reputation of the latter. He says in this connection (I, 239) "Generally, only one side of the character of Hillel has been presented by writers, and even this in greatly exaggerated language. His much-lauded gentleness, peacefulness, and charity were rather negative than positive qualities. He was a philosophic Rabbi whose real interest lay in a far other direction than that of sympathy with the people, and whose motto seemed indeed to imply: 'We, the sages, are the people of God; but this people, who know not the law, are cursed'."

The reference is to Abot I. 13, 14, and no reference could well have been more unfortunate. Not only does the *soi-disant* quotation not appear in the text, but it cannot by any violence be derived from it. The passage, according to Taylor's excellent translation, runs as follows: "Hillel said: Be of the disciples of Aaron; loving peace, and pursuing peace; loving mankind, and bringing them nigh to the Torah (the Law). He used to say: A name made great is a

name destroyed; he who increases not, decreases, and he who will not learn (or teach) deserves slaughter; and he who serves himself with the tiara perishes."

These utterances are not addressed and do not refer to the people at large, but are clearly injunctions to the disciples. Taylor's note[29] throws further light on the passage: "He who learns from his teacher and adds not to his words, not having intelligence to go beyond what he has been expressly taught, will come to an end. 'His mother will bury him'; or will bring to an end and lose what he has learned by rote. Cf. St. Matt. XXV. 29. He who refuses to impart his knowledge (or 'who will not learn at all') commits a deadly sin."

If this quotation from Abot gives us any impression of the disposition of Hillel, it is hardly that he was a cynical or even unsympathetic egoist.[30]

Dr. Edersheim lays much stress upon the vainglory and pride of the Rabbis, and the arrogant claims for respect, authority, and almost divine reverence, which they made for their utterances and ordinances. He cites, with evident satisfaction, the three or four well-known passages in which the words of tradition are praised above the words of Scripture.[31] (See I, 98, 100; II, 15, 407. Comp. Eisenmenger, I, 5, 10, 312, 322, and *passim*).

Now we must perforce refrain from entering into the controversy in regard to the supposed "Oral Law", and the living stream of divine tradition which the Rabbis believed they were handing down to posterity. We may, however, again refer to Taylor's commentary on Abot (p. 119, *ad fin.*),

where, in speaking of the "sayings tending to the exaltation of παράδοσις and Scribe-Law," he adds, that "in drawing inferences from them allowance must be made for their rhetorical and dialectic character. They are commonly put forward as opinions in debate rather than as authoritative decisions."

Two essential points should be noted here. First, that one main reason for the high account set upon the orthodox traditional law in the age of Jesus was the fear of national schism, which was best avoided by a rigid adherence to a single and authoritative exposition and expansion of the Pentateuchal Code; and we must always remember that politics and religion were not severed from each other in the Judea of that period. Secondly, that the "words of the Scribes," which are so exalted in these familiar passages, are not the words of any chance Rabbi or of all of them together, but those words only which were officially promulgated by generally accepted authorities. Such necessary and historical qualifications cannot be gathered from Dr. Edersheim's attacks, but, as we shall see, they can be gathered from the Rabbinic quotations by which these attacks are supported. He says: "Each Scribe outweighed all the common people, who must accordingly pay him every honour....Such was to be the honour to be paid to their sayings that they were to be absolutely believed, even if they were o declare that to be at the right hand which was at the left, or vice-versa".[31a]

It will be observed that this excessive belief and respect is to be paid to all scribes as a body.

The reference adduced in support of this state-

ment is Sifre 105a. This passage runs as follows: "Any turning aside from the teaching of the Sanhedrin of Jersualem is punishable by death, but a turning aside from the teaching of the Sanhedrin of Jabneh is not so punishable. For a transgression of an ordinance based upon the Pentateuch law death may be imposed; not for the transgression of a law which is purely traditional. If they tell you that what is right is left and what is left is right, hearken to them."

From this passage we see incidentally that in one most significant particular the words of the scribes are made inferior in importance to the words of the Bible. But as regards the main allegation of Dr. Edersheim, it is plain that the last portion of the passage does not refer to all the scribes but to the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem, that is to the highest court of justice in council assembled. That, again, the reason why the judgments and decisions of the Sanhedrin were rated so highly was mainly a fear of national and political schism is clearly indicated by the statement that the Sanhedrin of Jabneh could not punish a transgression of its ordinances with death.

For the Sanhedrin of Jabneh was founded after the destruction of the Temple, when, the national unity having ceased, there was no longer any danger of national schism. This, the correct interpretation of the passage referred to by Dr. Edersheim, will show how very seriously he misunderstood it. But this is not all, for that very blind obedience to the rulings of the Sanhedrin of Jerusalem, claimed in this passage, is not undisputed in the Talmuds.

Dr. Edersheim so frequently refers to the Talmud

of Jerusalem, that it is a pity that, for the sake of justice, he did not refer to it here. We will supply the omission. The passage on Sifre plays upon the verse in Deuteronomy(17. 11), where it is said: "Thou shalt not diverge from the sentence which they tell thee, to the right hand nor to the left," or, as the literal translation of the Hebrew idiom would run, "right and left." Now, in Yerushalmi Horayot 45b we read: "We might believe that we were bound to obey the Sanhedrin even if they told us of the right that it was left, and of the left that it was right; to prevent this, the Law says: 'when they tell you right and left' ". Here, by a characteristically Talmudic manipulation of the words, the text is supposed to mean: "Only when they tell you that right is right, and left is left are you to obey them, but not otherwise." This strange use of Scripture words may be a surprise to those who are not familiar with the Rabbinical method of reasoning, but, at all events, we have here a direct contradiction of even our very modified version of the passage on which Dr. Edersheim's proposition depends.

We now take a still more conspicious illustration of the way in which Dr. Edersheim, at the expense of an accurate exegesis, endeavors to prove his thesis of the arrogance and pride of the Rabbis: "Perhaps we ought here to point out one of the most important principles of Rabbinism, which has been almost entirely overlooked in modern criticism of the Talmud. It is this: that any ordinance, not only of the divine Law, but of the Rabbis, even though only given for a particular time or occasion, or for a special reason,

remains in full force for all time, unless expressly recalled by God."[32]

The passage is no doubt somewhat intricate, but it is hardly so obscure as to justify the entirely erroneous version given by Dr. Edersheim. We can only partly explain this curious view of its meaning by assuming that he has confounded the thing to be proved with the evidence which is to prove it.

The general drift of the passage is the following: Its object is to prove that any decision of a majority (in a Sanhedrin of Rabbis) can only be repealed by the decision of another majority, even although the reason for the former decision has ceased. The proof is taken from two passages in Scripture and one of tradition. The Scripture passages give two cases, in each of which God formally repeals His own command, although the occasion for that command had ceased. The example from tradition gives a third case, where a purely Rabbinic ordinance was formally repealed by the Rabbis.

The whole passage in Bezah runs as follows: "Every ordinance of a majority can only be repealed by another majority, even although the cause of its original promulgation has disappeared. Rabbi Joseph said: How can I deduce this? Because it is written: 'Go get you into your tents again' (Deuteronomy 5. 30), and it is also written: 'When the trumpet soundeth long, they shall come up to the mount' (Exodus 19. 13). We have also learned that the produce of fruit trees in the fourth year of their growth, situated within a day's journey of Jerusalem, must be brought thither in kind and

eaten on the spot. It may not be turned into money, and merely its value eaten at Jerusalem. According to Ula, the reason for this ordinance was that part of the produce might be used to decorate the streets of Jerusalem. A Baraita, moreover, mentions the following incident.[32a] Rabbi Eliezer had a vineyard within a day's journey of Jerusalem. He was about to place its fruits of the fourth year at the free disposal of the poor, in order to avoid the trouble of taking it himself to Jerusalem, when one of his disciples said to him: 'This ordinance has been formally repealed by the body of your colleagues'. "

This stringing together of three apparently disconnected texts is a fairly typical example of Talmudic argument, but is really more simple than it looks. It merely gives the two instances from Scripture and the one instance from tradition already referred to. The verse from Deuteronomy, when compared with Exodus 19. 15, shows that, although the cause for the command given in Exodus—namely, the approaching promulgation of the Ten Commandments—had lapsed, it was nevertheless necessary that a new divine injunction should be given before the people were at liberty to return to their wives and to their tents. The second instance from Scripture, namely Exodus 19.13, as compared with Exodus 19.11, is a similar illustration to the same effect.

The instance from tradition is somewhat more complicated. According to Leviticus 19. 23, the produce of all fruit trees was forbidden for the first three years after they were planted, and the prod-

uce of the fourth year was to be "holy for a merry-making unto the Lord." This expression was traditionally understood to mean that these fruits, like the tithes mentioned in Deuteronomy 12. 22–27, were to be brought to Jerusalem and eaten there as a thanksgiving to God.

But the same concession which was made with regard to the tithes was also granted here; it was allowed to turn the produce into money and take that to Jerusalem. But if—a point explained by Rashi and the other commentators—the fruits of the fourth year were actually given away, the responsibility of bringing them to Jerusalem rested with those who accepted the gift. Such recipients would naturally be the poor. The reason why the Rabbis wished that the produce should actually be brought to Jerusalem was that part of it should be used for decking the streets of the beloved city. But Rabbi Eliezer lived after the destruction of the capital, and yet he was going to fulfil the law by putting his vineyard at the disposal of the poor. The reason for the law had ceased. There were no streets to decorate, but the Rabbi did not regard himself free from obligation, till he was told that the law had been formally repealed by a fresh ordinance of the Rabbis.

Thus we see that where an ordinance has been given by God, God repeals it; where the ordinance is given by the Rabbis, the Rabbis repeal it. But that "any ordinance, even of the Rabbis, remains in full force for all the time, unless expressly recalled by God"—of this most extraordinary allegation, Bezah

5b says not a single word. And, as our readers will remember, it is upon this passage from Bezah that Edersheim based his argument.

If one favorite charge of Dr. Edersheim against the Rabbis is that they set tradition above the Writ, another is that they set the study of that tradition and of the law generally above the practice of pious works. Dr. Edersheim is here treading a path which has been made wide and easy for him by the labors of previous writers. But as he always endeavors to substantiate his accusations by Rabbinical allusions, so here, too, the marginal note at the very crisis of his charge has a reference ready to our hand. Our author assures us that "the merit of Israel might in theory be supposed to flow from 'good work,' of course, including the strict practice of legal piety, and from the study of the law. But in reality it was 'study' alone to which such supreme merit attached. Practice required knowledge for its directions, such as the Am ha-Arez ('country people,'—plebeians, in the Jewish sense of being unlearned) could not possess, who had bartered away the highest crown for a spade with which to dig. And the Sages, 'the great ones of the world,' had long settled it that study was before works" (I, 85).

We are bidden to turn to "Jer. Chag. I. hal. 7, towards the end", and we very willingly accept this invitation. The passage in question shall be literally translated for our readers: Rabbi Judah, when he saw a bridal or a funeral procession pass along the street, was wont to turn to his scholars, and say: "Works go before study". In the house of Arim, at Lud, a vote was taken on the question, and it was decided

that study went before works. Rabbi Abbahu who lived at Caesarea, sent his son to Tiberias to study there.[33] After a time, he was told that his son was devoting himself to acts of charity, such as helping in the burial of the dead. Then he wrote to him and said: "Is it because there are no graves in Caesarea, that I sent you to Tiberias?" Long ago, moreover, was it decided in the upper chamber of the house of Arim that study went before works. But the Rabbis in Caesarea taught that this pre-eminence of study only applies when acts of charity can be performed by some one else, but if there is no one else to perform them, then works go before study.

As a preliminary explanation of this passage, it must be noted that it was regarded as a work of charity to accompany the bride to her husband's house and to follow a funeral to the cemetery. Rabbi Judah was, therefore, accustomed, when he saw either a marriage or a funeral procession passing before him, to break off his disquisitions on the law and, surrounded by his disciples, to follow the party of mirth or mourning to its destination. It was in such occupations that the son of Rabbi Abbahu was spending his time, and his father wrote to remonstrate with him, in that he was "sent to college"[33a] for one thing and was wasting his days upon another.

We will quote one more parallel passage before going further. It is found in Kiddushin 40b: It happened long ago, that Rabbi Tarfon and the elders were assembled in the upper chamber of the house of Nitsah, and the question was started: "Which is greater, works or study?" Rabbi Tarfon argued

that works were greater, while Rabbi Akiba set study before works. Then they all declared that study was greater because it led to works.

Now the impression left on the mind after reading Dr. Edersheim's words is that, while the bare theory of the Rabbis might be that Israel's merits flowed from works, in their heart of hearts they really believed that the most meritorious and "paying" thing was study and study alone. That would hardly be the view taken by an impartial reader of the quoted passages, even as they stand without a word of commentary. And with some exegetical and historical explanation almost the very contrary of Dr. Edersheim's suggestions will be seen to be the truth.

It is a pity that Dr. Edersheim has not made more frequent use of Graetz's "History of the Jews".[34] He would have found there (vol. iv, pp. 173, 175, and note 17) an accurate account of the historical circumstances under which the decisions at the houses of Arim and Nitsah were made. Both refer to the same occasion, a time of unparalleled calamity in Jewish history. The awful persecution of the Jews under Hadrian aimed at the entire destruction of spiritual life among the people. The practice of the various ordinances was forbidden under the most appalling penalties, but perhaps the direst punishment awaited those who met for the purpose of teaching and studying the divine Law. Hadrian or his viceregents were astute enough to see that if the stream of tradition failed, and if the religious life were no longer fed by the usual supply of teachers and scholars, Judaism

must assuredly perish by means as certain as the almost impracticable annihilation of the entire race.

Under these circumstances, the decision referred to in both passages was made. It was felt that, whatever the peril, the law must still be studied, and that teaching and learning were more important (not more "meritorious") than practice, because they were its indispensable condition and forerunner. In the story relating to Rabbi Abbahu and his son this decision of the conference at Lud is applied for a somewhat different purpose. In the decision of the conference at Lud the "works" which are subordinated to "study" refer especially to the various ordinances of the law—such as the prohibitions of labor on the Sabbath, the celebration of the Passover and so on—the observance of which might be neglected were life endangered by their fulfilment. On the other hand, in the contrary opinion to which Rabbi Abbahu took exception, the "works" allude to definite acts of charity which are of an all-engrossing character when once earnestly pursued. It is obvious that just as the fellows and scholars of our own universities must devote the main portion of their time not to "works" but to "study", so in ancient Judea was it necessary that the learned class should act in a similar manner. But we also see that in Judea "works" depended on "study", and "study" paved the way for "works"; moreover, that if workers were really wanted, "study" had to go to the wall. How far Dr. Edersheim then has drawn a legitimate conclusion from his Talmudic reference, when he says that it was "study" and study alone to which such supreme merit attached, we will now leave with some

confidence to the unprejudiced consideration of our readers.

If the misapprehension of the text, due to inadequate reading and coloring by preconceived notions, has led Dr. Edersheim into strange errors, he has been no less unfortunate with his translations of individual words. Of these we might multiply instances, but we shall content ourselves with a couple of sufficiently striking and characteristic cases. In the first of these, Dr. Edersheim apparently believes that the Greek word *ἰδιώτης* is the equivalent of the English word "idiot". In the second case, he translates the Chaldaic word *Safre* by "Scribes", when it ought to be rendered by "schoolmasters." Speaking of Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, he says: "Zacharias could not have been one of the 'learned', nor to the Rabbinists a model priest. They would have described him as an 'idiot' or a common 'rustic' priest, and probably have treated him with benevolent contempt".

In a foot-note our author gives the word "Hediot" in Hebrew characters, and adds that it means an unlearned or common priest, and complacently refers to Yebamot 59a. Turning to the reference we find no word about an unlearned or rustic priest. The word "Hediot"—transliterated into Hebrew from the Greek—merely meant an ordinary priest as distinguished from the high priests. Thus in Mishnah Yoma 7. 5, we are told that the high priest performs the functions of his office in eight garments, while the ordinary priest (*Kohen hediot*) ministers in only four garments. In Sanhedrin (10. 2) *hediot* is used to distinguish a private person from a royal person.

If Macaulay's fourth-form prodigy had made this mistake, it would have been discreditable but comic; if it had occurred once in a purely critical work, we should have regarded it as unimportant and probably attributed it to a printer's mistake. But Dr. Edersheim having adopted it, fastens upon it heartily, and reproduces it five times in as many consecutive pages (I, 141–144). In fact it is made to give the necessary color to one prolonged picture.

Again: "'these are questions of the Scribes', the Talmud observes ironically on one occasion (Jerushalmi Megilla; 74b, line 30 from the top,) showing, of course, that the verbal subtlety of the Scribe was already proverbial among the Scribes themselves." The reference is, indeed, accurate to a line, but the translation supplies a counterbalance of inaccuracy. The word *Safre* which Dr. Edersheim renders "Scribes", unhappily for the fate of a long crescendo passage of indictment, does not here refer to the Scribes at all but means children's teachers or schoolmasters, and the whole sentence signifies merely "these are elementary questions". A reference at the commentaries or to Frankel's *Introductio in Talmud Hierosolymitanum* would have rescued Dr. Edersheim from this grotesque blunder. Frankel's book is, indeed, included in Dr. Edersheim's list of authorities, but unfortunately it is written in Hebrew.

Dr. Edersheim is not wholly successful when he deals with the laudatory Rabbinical figures, "a well-plastered cistern" and "a welling spring of water". In vol. I, p. 93, in a passage already frequently referred to, he mentions the former epithet as one among

the many exaggerated phrases applied to the Scribes. On page 412, while improving a detail of his elaborate contrast, Dr. Edersheim triumphs in the idea that a "well-plastered cistern" was the limit of praise that could be given to the teaching of the Rabbis, and he states categorically that the figure of the "well of water springing up" was never applied to them. "The difference", continues Dr. Edersheim, "is very great. For it is the boast of Rabbinism, that its disciples drink of the waters of their teachers; chief merit lies in the receptiveness, not spontaneity, and higher praise cannot be given than that of being a well-plastered cistern, which lets not out a drop of water, and in that sense is a spring whose waters continually increase. But this is quite the opposite, etc." (I, 412).

On this proposition Dr. Edersheim builds a portion of his "Contrast". Now the question is here of no great importance in itself, but as a matter of fact, Dr. Edersheim's argument is entirely baseless. The "welling-spring", so far from being an unused metaphor by the Rabbis, was quite well known to them in this relation. The very passage (Abot 2. 10, 11) upon which Dr. Edersheim relies, cuts the ground from under his feet. It runs, according to Taylor's literal translation:—"Five disciples were there to Rabban Jochanan ben Zakkai, and these were they: R. Eliezer ben Hyrqanos, and R. Jehoshua ben Chananiah, and R. Jose the Priest, and R. Shimeon ben Nathanael, and R. Eleazar ben Arak. He used to recount their praise; Eliezer ben Hyrqanos is a plastered cistern which loseth not a drop; Jehoshua ben Chananiah—happy is she that bare him; Jose the

Priest is pious; Shimeon ben Nathanael is a sinfearer; Eleazar ben Arak is a welling-spring. He used to to say, if all the wise of Israel were in a scale of the balance, and Eliezer ben Hyrqanos with them, and Eleazar ben Arak in the other scale, he would outweigh them all."

The two figures were thus used, and used in contrast, about different Rabbis, and to adopt for once Dr. Edersheim's methods of reference—only we do so with textual support—it will be seen that the waters of the welling spring were intended to serve no other purpose than to benefit the world. For, in *Abot de-Rabbi Natan*, the same R. Eleazar ben Arak is called "A welling spring, overflowing, whose waters ever increase, so that the words may be fulfilled: 'Let thy fountains be dispersed abroad, and rivers of waters in the streets'" (Proverbs 5. 16).

No feature of Rabbinism is more commonly held up by the enemies of the Talmud to scorn and loathing than its attitude towards the heathen and the whole Gentile world. We should expect similar things of Dr. Edersheim, nor is our expectation doomed to disappointment. He returns again and again to the charge, and refers to or quotes without scruple all those passages which a long array of writers, from Eisenmenger of the last century down to Rohling of our own, have reiterated with dogged, unwearied pertinacity.[35]

It is no surprise to us that Dr. Edersheim should have passed over in silence, or in a few instances sought to explain away, the many passages on the other side which the apologists of the Talmud

are wont to bring forward. Such a suppression is, nevertheless, not wholly commendable in a scientific work which attempts *sine studio et ira* to present a complete picture of a past age. Nor should it be forgotten that most of Dr. Edersheim's references are demonstrably later than the time of Jesus, in other words subsequent to the siege and sack of Jerusalem. The memories of that event and all its horrors—above all, of the destruction of the Temple—were calculated to embitter and exasperate the feelings of the Jews towards the Gentiles. And, be it noted, the Rabbis *did* care for their national Temple and its services, Dr. Edersheim's statement to the contrary notwithstanding. But it may be granted that at no time did the vast majority of the Rabbis think better of their enemies than their enemies did of them. It is for the historian—though it is not for Dr. Edersheim—to weigh and consider how far either side was or was not excused in its hatred of the other by the circumstances of the time.

Dr. Edersheim contends that the Gentile world is excluded from the ordinary Rabbinic conception of the "Kingdom of Heaven". The eschatology of of the Talmud is one of the most difficult points. What exact relation the terms "the world to come," "the Kingdom of Heaven", and "the days of the Messiah" bear to one another, in what order they follow, and in what places they shall be experienced, are all questions which have been variously disputed by Jewish scholars without any very satisfactory results having as yet been obtained. But it is clear that they are precisely those points on which indi-

vidual Rabbis gave rein to their fantasy, and where one can least hope to deduce a rational or connected system.

The liturgy of the Jews is a better exponent of the real feelings of the people than these morbid excrescences of a diseased imagination brooding over its wrongs, which are so frequently quoted by Dr. Edersheim. That liturgy is often cited by him on other occasions; he might with advantage have cited it on this occasion. Here we give a translation of a short Hebrew prayer—at least as ancient as Dr. Edersheim's references—which was, and still is, recited on one of the most solemn festivals in the calendar, the day of memorial or the New Year: "Our God and the God of our fathers, reign Thou in Thy glory over the whole world, and in Thy majesty be exalted over the whole earth; shine forth in the excellency of Thy supreme power over all mankind, that everything that has been made be made sensible that Thou hast made it; that everything formed may know that Thou hast formed it, and that all who have breath in their nostrils may declare that the Lord God of Israel reigneth, and in His supreme power ruleth over all".

While referring to Dr. Edersheim's belief in the bitterness with which Jewish writers regarded all those outside their own faith, it may not be out of place to indicate a curious blunder into which his enthusiasm has led him. He is speaking of the enmity that existed between the Jews and the Samaritans, and he says: "To the same hatred caused by national persecution, we must impute such expres-

sions as that he who received hospitably a Samaritan has himself to blame if his children have to go into captivity" (I, 401).

The marginal note refers us to Sanhedrin 104a where we shall certainly find the word *Cuti*, as the Hebrew for Samaritan. But we should have imagined that the veriest tyro in Talmudic study was aware that the word Samaritan or *Cuti* is one of the various expressions which an all too scrupulous censorship has substituted for the generic term *Nokri*, or foreigner. *Nokri* might possibly, so the censor believed, refer to Christians, hence *Cuti*, or Samaritan, which could not allude to Christians, was a convenient alternative. Whether the substitution changed the meaning of a passage or turned it into nonsense was a matter of the most trifling insignificance to the censor. In the present instance Dr. Edersheim might have been saved from his elementary mistake if he had glanced at the passage in Isaiah which is the basis and authority for the churlish statement in the Talmud. Isaiah (39. 1-8) prophesies the captivity of Hezekiah's descendants, because the king had shown courtesy and hospitality to the ambassadors of Merodach Baladan, the prince of Babylonia. This Merodach was a simple heathen and no Samaritan; in the rare first edition of the Talmud, which escaped the censor's alterations, Dr. Edersheim will find that *Nokri* and not *Cuti* is the subject of the extract in question.

This mistake is certainly of no very great importance, but, taken together with others which we have already pointed out, the few we have yet to mention, and the many we could add, did space per-

mit, does it not raise a not unwarranted suspicion that Dr. Edersheim, in spite of his learning and erudition, is yet not qualified to lay before us a trustworthy picture of the Talmud and its teachings?

The religion and the theology of the Rabbis is subjected by Dr. Edersheim to severe criticism. Their religion, according to him, was pure externalism, which, while it "indicated, with the most minute and painful punctiliousness, every legal ordinance binding on conduct, left the inner man, the spring of actions, untouched alike as regards faith and morals" (I, 105).[36] Their theology lacked "system" and "authority," and was nothing more "than a mass of conflicting statements and debasing superstition". "A man might hold or propound almost any views so long as he adhered in practice and teaching to the traditional ordinances." It is impossible for us to discuss these charges in this place; they are familiar charges and very fashionable at this time.[37] The eager anxiety of the Rabbis to regulate all conduct (not excluding moral conduct, be it remembered) by an endless series of detailed enactments, their naïve ignorance of dogmatic theology as a system, and the liberty they granted towards the free exercise and play of the religious imagination are all indicative of a peculiar religious attitude, but not necessarily of a want of religion. It is not, however, our object on this occasion to present the religious ideas of the Rabbis in a more favorable light: we must confine ourselves to Dr. Edersheim's method of using the Talmud in support of his own statements.

Dr. Edersheim is apparently not perfectly at

one with himself on these questions. In one passage where he is speaking of the conditions under which a Jewish child began its life, he says: "These conditions were indeed for that time the happiest conceivable, and such as only centuries of Old Testament life training could have made them". Our readers will observe the words "Old Testament life training"; but surely if the "life training" depended ultimately on the Old Testament, it was more immediately fostered and tended by the very Rabbis whom Dr. Edersheim so industriously decries. "There were not homes like those in Israel," where "from the first day of its existence a religious atmosphere" surrounded the child of Jewish parents" (I, 226, 227). But though there was a "religious atmosphere", there was no "spirit". That had been "crushed"; religion had been "externalized," and the Judaism of the days of Christ "was no longer the pure religion of the Old Testament" (vol. I, 107).

But leaving these somewhat apparent contradictions, which in a writer less imbued with enthusiasm for his subject would wear the aspect of disingenuousness, let us turn to a few individual passages where Dr. Edersheim seeks to prove the general drift of his argument by direct reference to the Rabbinical literature.

Dr. Edersheim has a great deal to say about the contrast between the teaching of the Gospels and that of the Rabbis in regard to sin and repentance. Thus he concludes that "Rabbinism knew nothing of a forgiveness of sin free and unconditional, unless

in the case of those who had not the power of doing anything for their atonement" (vol I, 510). The reference adduced in support of this statement is Sifre 70b. Alluding to Deuteronomy 3. 23-26, and II Samuel 24. 10, the passage runs thus: "Israel had two good rulers—Moses and David. Each prayed for the forgiveness of his sins, not in virtue of the number of his good deeds, but as the free grace of God. But if they whose worth was so great acted in this manner, how much more should we imitate them herein, who may compare ourselves to the least of their disciples?".

The exhortation is that we can only justly ask forgiveness as a grace of God, and not as a reward for our own righteousness. This teaching, which can hardly be considered as good evidence of the "self-righteousness" of the Rabbis, has obviously nothing whatever to do with Dr. Edersheim's mysterious allegation. Again, our author admits that the Rabbis are continually praising repentance, but as repentance is in itself a good thing, which is also admired in the Gospels, he is bound to show, in order to maintain throughout his contrast between Scribe and Evangelist, that Rabbinic repentance was a cheap caricature of the true article. Thus we find passages of this kind (vol. I, 509): "Although Rabbinism had no welcome to the sinner, it was unceasing in its call to repentance and in extolling its merits..... 'One hour of penitence and good works outweighs the whole world to come.'.....The penitent was really the great one, since his strong nature had more in it of the evil impulse, and the conquest of it by the

penitent was really of greater merit than the abstinence from sin".

For this last statement the marginal note refers us to Sanhedrin 99b. The passage is too long to quote, but from previous examples, our readers will believe us when we tell them that there is not a word in it which could possibly be made to justify Dr. Edersheim's assertions. There is a quaint passage in the Talmud (Berakot 34b) where a discussion takes place on the relative merits in the eyes of God of the repentant sinner and of him who has never yielded to sin. It is not the undisputed view of the Talmud, as Dr. Edersheim suggests, that "the true penitent really occupied a higher place—stood where the perfectly righteous could not stand"; but if it were, would it be in flagrant contrast to the celebrated dictum of Jesus: "Joy shall be in Heaven over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninety nine just persons which need no repentance"?

When, indeed, Dr. Edersheim comes to that passage, he appears to have entirely forgotten all that the much-abused Rabbis said about penitence and its merits in the sight of God. Here, to illustrate the "terrible contrast," he says merely: "Christ said: 'There is joy in Heaven over one sinner that repenteth.' Pharisaism said—and we quote here literally—'There is joy before God when those who provoke Him perish from the world'".

Now we are quite willing to allow that in this instance Dr. Edersheim has correctly translated his Rabbinical reference; but we would fain ask the learned Doctor if he has read another passage, which finds

a prominent place in the Mishnah, where an arch-Pharisee says: "When man has to suffer because of his sin, the Shekinah (Divine Manifestation) laments: 'Woe to my head, woe to my arm.' If then it is so painful to Heaven if the blood of the wicked is shed, how much more when that of the righteous?" (Sanhedrin 6. 5.). This extract and many others of a similar character have been carefully ignored by Dr. Edersheim; they are nevertheless in existence and they prove that, since all Pharisees thought alike on these questions, the "terrible contrast" cannot, at any rate, be proved in the manner in which Dr. Edersheim attempts to prove it.

If we stop here, it is not for lack of material wherewith to continue. Our initial difficulty was as to which instances should be selected. But our promise will have been sufficiently fulfilled if our readers will believe that Dr. Edersheim's book is not an extreme illustration of the superficial and unscientific treatment ordinarily accorded to Rabbinical literature. And if our readers wonder how a learned writer, who in other respects appears to be an honest inquirer, can have committed such mistakes, we refer them to our chief propostion—that the Talmud is not studied for its own sake, but always to subserve some foreign purpose. Dr. Edersheim has apparently searched the Talmud diligently, but has done so with a mind preoccupied. He has arduously ransacked it for "contrasts", and has found them by misunderstanding some parts of it, and by neglecting others.

Is, then, the proper study of the Talmud a hopeless undertaking? By no means; but the study must

be approached honestly, and with a singleness of purpose. A thorough and unselfish study, free from all preconceived opinions, from all intention of attack or defence, from all idea of using the Talmud for any extraneous purpose, should precede any attempt to write about it. We do not promise the student, as others have done, that he will find in the old Rabbinical literature all the sciences and philosophies of our later and varied civilization buried in its pages. We do not bid "philologers, historians, and statesmen" seek in the records of the Rabbis for instruction and counsel. We say nothing of the "many discoveries thought to belong to a recent age, but in truth well known to these ancient doctors".[88]

But this much we say with confidence: that anyone who cares for the history of religion and its phenomena will find the study of the Talmud and its kindred literature no thankless task; for in the Talmud he will discern an earnest desire—not surpassed or scarcely equalled elsewhere—to fill and penetrate the whole of human life with religion and the sense of law and right. This is the grand purpose of the Talmud, so far as it can be said to have any purpose at all. That the Rabbis have not always succeeded in their twofold aim, and that an inflexible carrying out of the principles of the Law has occasionally conflicted with the true interest of religion, we are fain to admit. It was the adage of an old Rabbi that "the Torah (by which he here probably meant the Pentateuch, to him the source of law and religion in one) was not given to the angels, but intended for men". And the Rabbis were not gods, nor demigods, nor angels;

they were mortal men, and if their holy aims have frequently been shipwrecked on the rocks of human imperfection, as mortals they should not be too harshly judged.

But be our opinions of the Rabbis what they may, we may fairly claim, in the name of scientific justice, as well as that of Christian charity, that he who proposes to pass judgment upon them shall first hear their case, and understand it; in other words, that he shall read the Talmud, and critically examine it, before he begins to write about it and to expound it.

THE TALMUD

The *Talmud* (תלמוד), meaning a 'teaching', an 'inference,' or a 'doctrine,' is a term commonly applied to a collection of works embodying the Oral Law—תורה שבעל פה, literally 'the Torah by mouth'—handed down to the Jews by way of tradition, in contradistinction to the Written Law—תורה שבכתב literally 'the Torah in writing.' The origin of this tradition is unknown: the common view of the medieval authorities, claiming the same Mosaic authorship and high antiquity for it as for the Scriptures, is uncritical. But, as the Oral Law is closely connected with the history and development of the hermeneutics of the Scriptures, its commencement may safely be dated back to the exilic period in which was first established the institution of the Synagogue, whose main function consisted in teaching and interpreting the word of God.

The Hebrew term for 'interpretation' is *Midrash* (מדרש, cf. 2 Ch. 13.22); and this term, like the Rabbinic term *Kabbalah*, קבלה, matter received by way of tradition), which includes the Prophets and the Hagiographa, may likewise, perhaps, be applied to certain portions of the canonical writings, *e.g.* Chronicles. The prominent feature of the *Midrash*, however, as an instrument for enlarging upon and expanding the word of the Scriptures, is best discernible in the ancient rabbinical productions,

which in spite of some hyperbolical expressions, provoked by heat of controversy, never seriously aspired to the dignity of Scripture, and which as a consequence, they for the most part properly kept apart text and interpretation, thus clearly showing the process of expansion.

The results gained by this method varied in their character with the nature of the Scripture passages, according as they were legal and ritual, or spiritual and homiletical. The former classes are comprised under the name *Halakah* (הלכה), signifying guidance, a rule of practice, a legal decision; and the term extends also to the usages, customs (*Minhagim* מנהגים), ordinances (*Takkanot* תקנות), and decrees (*Gezerot* גזרות), for which there is little or no authority in the Scriptures. The latter (spiritual and homiletical) are classified under the term *Haggadah* (הגדה, Aramaic אגדה),[1] meaning a tale, a narrative, an explanation, a homily; and the term includes also the gnomic lore of the Rabbis, as well as stories and legends bearing upon the lives of post-Biblical Jewish saints. Such topics as astronomy and astrology, medicine and magic, theosophy and mysticism, and similar subjects, falling mostly under the heading of folk-lore, pass as a rule also under the name of *Haggadah*.

The schools active in this work of the interpretation and expansion of the Scriptures extend over many centuries, and are known under various designations, each designation marking in succession a different period.

I. The *Soferim* (סופרים), "Scribes," commencing with Ezra and going down to the Maccabaean period (450-100). Scarcely anything is known of their literary activity; the term 'Words of the *Soferim*' (דברי סופרים) is used indifferently by the Rabbis of *Halakot* dating from various ages, and implying in most cases not the authorship of, but the authority for, certain given statements. Less vague are the Rabbinical references to the "Men of the Great Assembly" (אנשי כנסת הגדולה) and "their Remnant" (שיירי אנשי כנסת הגדולה), thought by some scholars to be identical with the *Soferim*, or at least to have formed the executive of the latter.[2]

To these *Soferim* are attributed not only certain teaching activity (as "Raise many disciples", *Abot* 1.1), but also many ordinances and decrees, the most important of which are those bearing upon the arrangement and the completion of the Canon of the Bible, the reading of the Law on certain days in the week, the fixing of the daily prayers (probably in six benedictions now embodied in the so-called Eighteen Benedictions, שמונה עשרה), and the introduction of the saying of grace after meals. The custom of pouring libations of water at the feast of Tabernacles, and going in procession round the altar with branches of willow trees, declared by some Rabbis to have been introduced by the prophets, as well as the so-called 'Laws unto Moses from Mount Sinai' (amounting to the number of forty-three, more than a third of which refer to the preparation of the phylacteries), may also have dated from those *Soferic* times, remote-

ness of assigned date pointing as a rule, to the pre-Maccabaean period.[3]

II. The *Zugot* (זוגות; Gr. Ζεῦγος), "Pairs," a name given to the leading teachers that flourished between the Maccabaean and the Herodian period (*c.* 150-30). Five such 'Pairs' are recorded in the Rabbinical literature, extending over five generations, and succeeding each other in the following order: 1. Jose b. Joezer of Zereda and Jose b. Johanan of Jerusalem 2. Joshua b. Perahiah and Nittai of Arbela; 3. Judah b. Tabbai and Simeon b. Shetah; 4. Shemaiah and Abtalyon; 5. Hillel and Shammai.[4]

According to tradition each "Pair" represents the heads of the Sanhedrin of their age, the one whose name occurs first in the list serving in the capacity of *Nasi* (נשיא), "Prince" or "President" of the Sanhedrin, the other in that of 'Ab Beth Din (אב בית דין), "Father of the House of Judgment," or "Vice-President." This tradition is contested by many modern scholars as incompatible with the statements of Josephus and of the New Testament, according to which the High-Priest for the time being was *ex-officio* the President of the Sanhedrin. But, whatever their particular function and title were, the existence of the "Pairs" as the heads of a religious corporation to which the large bulk of the nation belonged, and which thus formed an important factor in the development of the Oral Law, cannot well be doubted.[5] To them are attributed not only various *Haggadic* sayings (*Abot* 1. 4-15), but also *Halakic* statements, as well as certain ordinances and decrees.

It was under the first "Pair" (also called *Eshkoloth* אשכולות [identical with Greek σχολή?], a title that disappears with them) that, according to the testimony of the Rabbis, the first difference of opinion regarding the performance of certain religious practices occurred between the sages. The *Halakot* attributed to Jose b. Joezer, the first named of this "Pair," as well as the ordinances and decrees ascribed to him and to his colleague of the first "Pair," were apparently composed in his age, the language of the *Halakot* (Aramaic ['*Eduyyot* 8. 4]) and the subject of the ordinances and decrees (Levitical purity) being both signs of antiquity. Shimeon b. Shetah of the third "Pair" is credited with having introduced several important reforms in various religious departments, whilst Shemaiah and Abtalyon were called the "Great Ones of the Generation" and the "Great Interpreters" (דרשנים גדולים).

The most important "Pair," however, are Hillel (the Elder) and Shammai (the Elder), in whose names more *Halakot* are recorded than of any other "Pair"; they are also the founders of two great schools (Bet Shammai, Bet Hillel, בית שמאי, בית הלל, "the House or School of Shammai" and "the House of Hillel"). which continued the work of their masters for some generations. Hillel, a native of Babylon and (according to tradition) a descendant of the house of David, was particularly famous for his meekness and humble-mindedness. Among other things he is reported to have said: 'Be of the disciples of Aaron, loving peace and pursuing peace, loving thy fellow-creatures, and drawing them near to the Torah'

(*Abot* 1. 12); whilst he also taught to a heathen seeking admission into Judaism: 'What is hateful to thyself do not to thy fellow-man; this is the whole Torah, the rest is only commentary' (*Shabbat* 30*b*). Shammai's saying was: 'Make thy Torah a fixed thing, say little and do much, and receive every man with a cheerful countenance' (*Abot* 1. 15); but he was not particularly famous for his gentle temper.

The most marked feature about these two leaders is their activity as interpreters of the Law and their application of the results of this interpretation to practice. Thus Shammai presses the words עד רדתה ("until it is subdued," *Deut.* 20.20) to mean that the act of subduing a hostile place must not be interrupted even on account of any religious consideration, and thus he permits the continuing of a battle even on Sabbath (*Shabbat* 19*a*). Hillel, by interpreting the term במועדו ("in its season"), inferred from it the *Halakah* that the duty of sacrificing the Paschal lamb overrules all consideration of Sabbath, when the 14th of Nisan falls on the seventh day of the week (*Pesahim* 66*a*).[6] Indeed it was Hillel who first framed the Rules of Interpretation, seven in number (Introduction to *Torat Kohanim*), which developed later into thirteen and more.

III. The *Tannaim* (תנאים), "Teachers", the name given to the authorities living during the first two centuries of the common era (*c.* 10–200), commencing with the schools of Shammai and Hillel and terminating with R. Judah the Patriarch, a great-grandson of Hillel. The period of the *Tannaim*, most of whom

bear the title *Rabbi* (רבי "my Master," but losing later its pronominal signification) or (more rarely) *Rabban* (רבן "Master"), may conveniently be divided into four successive generations, the principal men of which are:

First Generation (10-80).—The 'schools of Shammai and Hillel', comprising many teachers whose names have not come down to us. The underlying principle dividing these schools on many important points is not known; but on the whole the school of Shammai may perhaps be characterized as staunch conservatives in their adherence to Tradition, who allowed little room for the play of interpretation, and as rule were very rigorous in their decisions; whilst the school of Hillel, already described by the old Rabbis as 'pleasing and meek,' were more inclined to compromise in their teaching, greatly given to the development of the *Midrash*, and in general less severe in their *halakic* dicta. The most important of these teachers known by name are Rabban Gamaliel the Elder, and Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai, both of the school of Hillel. Gamaliel, a son (some say a grandson) of Hillel, is known for various reforms introduced by him, as well as for the part he took in the trial of the Apostle Paul (Acts. 5. 34–35); whilst Johanan was equally famous as one of the leaders of the peace party in the war against the Romans (66-70), and as the founder of the Academy of Jamnia, which became the centre of Jewish life and thought after the destruction of the Temple.

Second Generation (90-130).—Rabban Gamaliel II, President of the Academy of Jamnia after the

death of R. Johanan (having been rather autocratic in the treatment of his colleagues, he was removed from office for a time, but soon after reinstated); R. Eliezer b. Jacob I, who was considered a great authority in tradition regarding the structure and the arrangement of the service in the Temple; R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos, a brother-in-law of R. Gamaliel, and the head of a school in Lydda (though a disciple of R. Johanan b. Zakkai, of the school of Hillel, he cherished Shammaitic principles, which fact brought him into collision with the majority of his colleagues, and subsequently led to his excommunication); R. Joshua b. Hananiah, likewise a disciple of R. Johanan b. Zakkai, but unlike his colleague, R. Eliezer, with whom he had many controversies, of a humble and submissive disposition; R. Eleazar b. Azariah, who derived his pedigree from Ezra the Scribe, and who obtained the office of president of the Academy of Jamnia when R. Gamaliel was deposed.

To the younger teachers of this generation belong R. Tarfon, of the school of Shammai (?), who had attended the services in the Temple; R. Jose of Galilee, who had controversies with R. Tarfon and other *Tannaim*; R. Ishmael b. Elisha, best known for his thirteen Rules of Interpretation (see above). Together with other members of the Sanhedrin he emigrated from Jamnia to Usha, where he founded a school called after his name, to which various *Midrashim* are attributed. R. Akiba b. Joseph, a disciple of several older teachers of this generation, was master of most of the dis-

tinguished Rabbis of the next generation, and not less famous for his skill in systematizing the content of tradition than for his ingenious methods of interpretation, which enabled him to find a basis for all the enactments of the Oral Law in the Scriptures. This fact, together with his patriotic zeal and his martyrdom in the Hadrianic persecutions (*c.* 130), made him the most famous of the *Tannaim.*

To this generation belong also the older disciples of R. Akiba—Simeon b. 'Azzai and Simeon b. Zoma—best known for their moralizing sayings and mystical tendencies (in the direction of a Jewish gnosis) which they shared with their master, but from which, unlike the latter, they did not escape without injury. "The one gazed (into the chambers of heaven) and died, and the other gazed and was not in his mind." Their contemporary Elisha b. Abuyah, also called *Aher* ('the other one'), was less happy than these, for he 'gazed' and 'cut the branches,' that is, became an apostate.

Third Generation (130-160).—The disciples of R. Ishmael, of whom only two are known by their names (R. Josia and R. Jonathan), whilst the others are usually quoted as 'the Tanna of the school' of R. Ishmael. The younger disciples of R. Akiba are R. Meir, who continued the systematizing labors of his master, and is thus supposed to have laid the foundation of a Mishnah; R. Jehuda b. Ilai, who is called 'the first of the speakers'; R. Simeon b. Yohai, of whom R. Akiba said 'Be satisfied that I and thy Maker know thy powers'; R. Nehemiah,

to whom, as to the two last-mentioned Rabbis, various *tannaitic* compilations are attributed; R. Eleazar b.Shamu'a, round whom the greatest number of disciples gathered, and R. Jose b. Halafta, to whom the book *Seder 'Olam* (סדר עולם), containing a chronology of events and personages in the Bible, is attributed. Abba Saul, compiler of a Mishnah, and the Patriarch R. Simon II b. Gamaliel II, are also included in the third generation.

Fourth Generation (160-220).—R. Nathan ha-Babli, who emigrated from Babylon to Palestine and there held under the last-mentioned Patriarch an office in the Sanhedrin the nature of which is not quite known; Symmachos, the disciple of R. Meir and a great authority in matters of civil law; and various other *Tannaim*, sons and disciples of the authorities of the preceding generation. The most important among them is the Patriarch R. Judah ha-Nasi, also called *Rabbenu ha-Kadosh* (רבנו הקדוש) 'Our Master, the Saint,' but more frequently *Rabbi*, 'the Master,' without adding his name. He was the son of the Patriarch R. Simon II, and the disciple of R. Simon b. Yohai and of R. Eleazar b. Shamua'; he presided over the Sanhedrin, which during this generation was, as it would seem, a migratory body, shifting from place to place, from Usha to Beth-Shearim, and thence to Sepphoris and Tiberias. This R. Judah is said to have maintained friendly relations with the Roman authorities of Palestine at that period. This fact, as well as the circumstances of his noble birth, great wealth, official position, saintly character, and his mastery

of the contents of the Oral Law, gave him an authority over his contemporaries never enjoyed by any other *Tanna*, and gathered round him a band of distinguished disciples and colleagues which rendered possible his work as compiler and codifier of the *Mishnah*.[7]

The literary productions of all these generations of *Tannaim*, as well as of their predecessors the *Zugot* and the *Soferim*, both in *Halakah* and in *Haggadah*, are, as far as they have been preserved, embodied in the following collections.

The *Mishnah* משנה[8] (from שנה), meaning a 'teaching', a 'repetition,' is a designation most appropriate for a work generally looked upon as the main depository of the contents of the Oral Law, which (in contradistinction to מקרא, reading matter, or the Scriptures) could be acquired only by means of constant repetition. This work, compiled (apart from some later additions) by R. Judah the Patriarch, is divided into six Orders (ששה סדרים=ש"ס), each of which contains several *Massiktot* (מסכתות, sing. מסכת, Aram. מסכתא, derived from נסך, meaning 'to weave'; comp. the Latin *textus*), whilst each tractate is divided into *Perakim* (פרקים, singular פרק), 'joints' or 'sections,' each of which, in its turn, consists of so many *Halakot* (in the sense of paragraphs). The number of the tractates is 63 (or, in another enumeration, 60), bearing titles [printed in Appendix A., p. 226ff], which are suggestive more or less of their varied contents, though extraneous matter that is in no way indicated by the title is everywhere introduced.

The idiom in which the *Mishnah* is compiled is

the New Hebrew, interspersed with occasional Greek and Latin words; its diction is fluent and easy when not disfigured, as all works coming to us from antiquity are, by interpolations and textual corruptions. The date of its compilation may be fixed about 220 C. E. This was undertaken and accomplished by R. Judah the Patriarch, not with the purpose of providing the nation with a legal code, but with the intention of furnishing them with a sort of thesaurus, incorporating such portions of the traditional lore as he considered most important. Hence the ground for his including in the work the opinions of the minority (*e.g.* of the school of Shammai), which only in a few exceptional cases were accepted as a norm for practice.

A preliminary acquaintance with the contents of the Scriptures bearing upon the topic expounded by tradition is always assumed; so that, *e. g.*, the tractate *Sukkah* commences: 'A booth (the interior of which is) higher than 20 cubits is disqualified,' thus premising the duty of living in booths for seven days according to Lev. 23. 42. In many cases even a knowledge of the institutions established by the Oral Law is presupposed. Hence such a statement as that with which the *Mishnah* commences: 'When do they begin to read the *Shema'* (*i.e.*, the three paragraphs in the Scriptures, Deut. 6.6-9, 11.13-21, and Num. 15.37-41, the first paragraph of which begins with the word *Shema'* שמע) in the evening? From the time the priests (in the case of defilement) come back (from their ritual baths) to eat their heave-offering' (*i.e.*, after sunset, see Lev. 22.4–7). The duty

or the custom of daily reading the *Shema'* is thus assumed as something generally known though not mentioned in the Scriptures.

The works after which R. Judah modelled his compilation and the sources upon which he drew were probably the older *Mishnah* collections, the first composition of which was, as there is good reason to believe, begun by the first successors of Shammai and Hillel, then compiled by R. Akiba, and continued by his disciple R. Meir, who enriched it by additions of the later *Tannaim*. This *Mishnah* became the groundwork of that of R. Judah, apart from various other collections of a similar kind (*e.g.* the *Mishnah* of Abba Saul), which were equally known to the compiler and utilized by him.[9]

The strata of these older compositions are still in many places discernible either by their style and phraseology or by the nature of their contents. An instance of the former is the passage illustrating the prohibition against transporting things on Sabbath from a space belonging to a private individual to that constituting a part of the public property. This commences יציאות השבת (*Shabbat* 1. 1), instead of הוצאות השבת, through which the Scripture expression אל יצא (Ex. 16.19) is still visible, and thus points to a time when the *Halakah* was still in its early stage, forming a sort of paraphrase of Scripture, not a set of abstract laws.

As an instance of the latter, it is sufficient to refer here to the historical description of the procession in which the sacrifice of the first-fruits was brought to the Temple (Exod. 23.19), concerning which we read

in *Bikkurim* 3.4: 'The pipe was playing before them (the pilgrims) until they arrived at the Temple mountain, when even Agrippa the king would take the basket (containing the first-fruits) on his shoulders, stepping forward till he reached the court; then the Levites spoke in song (chanted): "I will extol Thee O Lord, for Thou hast lifted me up" ' (Ps. 30.2). The mention of Agrippa (probably Agrippa I., *c.* 40) points to a contemporary document, since a Rabbi of a later period would, for the sake of emphasis, have named some Biblical potentate (*e.g.* Solomon), not a mere Herodian prince.[10] This is only a specimen of many other portions of the *Mishnah*, which contain lengthy descriptions of the sacrificial service on certain occasions, or give accounts of the architecture of the Temple, its administration (including lists of the names of the higher officials), and its economy; whilst other passages furnish us with records of actual transactions of the *Sanhedrin*, the procedure of the courts, and the various methods of execution. All these bear the stamp of their own age, and testify to the early date of their composition.

The question whether R. Judah, besides compiling, actually wrote down the *Mishnah*, is still a controverted point amongst modern scholars, as it was nearly a thousand years ago between the Franco-German and the Spanish authorities. The balance of evidence is still about equal on each side.

Three things, however, seem to be certain. First, there existed a law or custom, dating from ancient times, prohibiting the writing down of the contents of Tradition, though the Scripture support for this

custom (*Temurah* 14*b* and parallel passages) was not advanced till a comparatively late period (end of the second century). Ample evidence of this fact is afforded by the traditional term, 'Torah by mouth,' as well as by the various mnemotechnical aids to be found in the *Mishnah* (*e.g. Megillah* 1. 4-11, אין בין) and the homage paid to those who invented them (see *Yerushalmi Shekalim* 48*c*, regarding the grouping of *Halakot* in numbers, and *Abot de R. Natan* 18, respecting R. 'Akiba's arranging of the Torah in links).

Second, the prohibition did not extend to books of a *Haggadic* character (ספרי דאגדתא), of which we know that they both circulated among, and were read by the Rabbis. Under *Haggadah* was included also the gnomic literature as, for instance, the Wisdom of Ben Sira, which both the *Tannaim* and the *Amoraim*, as well as the *Geonim*, the authorities of a later period, (*e.g.* R. Saadya), knew in the Hebrew original and were constantly quoting, and of which fragments covering nearly two-thirds of the book have now been found after a disappearance of nearly 700 years.

Third, the prohibition was often disregarded, even in cases of *Halaka*, as in the case of the *Megillat Ta'anit* (מגלת תענית), containing a list of certain days in the year on which no fast could be declared, or the *Megillat Sammanim* (מגלת סמנים), "the Roll of Spices," treating of the preparation of the incense (Ex 30.34ff). in the Tabernacle and the Temple (*Yerushalmi Shekalim* 49*a*).

Owing to the great authority of R. Jhudae the

Patriarch, his compilation became the *Mishnah* κατ' ἐξοχήν, a sort of canonical collection of the teachings of the *Tannaim*, forming the text-book of the students of the Oral Law, round which centred all the comments, discussions and the additional matter produced by the succeeding generations. The other collections likewise confined to the teachings of the *Tannaim*, but composed in schools not presided over by the Patriarch, pass under the name either of משנה החיצונה *Mishnah ha-Hizonah* (more frequently the Aramaic ברייתא *Baraita*), 'the external *Mishnah*', or *Tosefta* (תוספתא), 'addition' (to the *Mishnah*).

No treatise representing the 'external *Mishnah*' has come down to us, but many hundreds of quotations from such external *Mishnahs* are scattered over the two *Talmuds*, mostly introduced by such phrases as תנו רבנן ('our Masters taught'), or תניא ('it is taught') or תנא and תני ('he taught'). But we possess a work bearing the name *Tosefta*, corresponding with the arangement of the *Mishnah*, and dealing with the same subjects. It shows marks of different ages; and, whilst it embodies portions coming from collections preceding our *Mishnah*, it presupposes the knowledge of the latter, whilst in some places it even affords comments and explanations taken from the *Gemara* and recast in the New Hebrew style of the *Mishnah*. It is thus safe to assume that the date of its final redaction falls in the later age of the *Amoraim*, though its composition may have been initiated by R. Hiyya and R. Hosha'ya, the disciples of R. Judah, to whom tradition attributes such a work undertaken in imitation of the *Tosefta* of R. Nehemiah,

who is credited with having collected 'additions' to the *Mishnah* of R. Akiba.

To this class of works also belong the so-called Minor Tractates bearing the following titles: *Abot de-R. Natan* (אבות דרבי נתן), a sort of *Tosefta* and *Midrash* to the tractate *Abot*, existing in two recensions;[11] *Masseket Soferim* (מסכת סופרים),[12] 'Scribes,' dealing with the laws relating to writing of the Scriptures. The text is in a bad condition, the interpolations and additions (on the Jewish liturgy, etc.) almost obliterating the original plan of the work, and it should be studied in connection with the tractates *Sefer Torah*, *Mezuzah* (law relating to the writing of certain verses from the Scriptures and to fixing them on the door-posts; see Deut. 6.9), and *Tefillin* (Phylacteries), edited by Kirchheim; *Masseket Semahot* ('joy' מסכת שמחות),[13] a euphemistic title for laws and customs connected with mourning—of which we have also a shorter recension edited by Ch. M. Horwitz under the title מסכת שמחות זוטרתי ('Tractate Joys, the Minor'); *Masseket Kallah* (מסכת כלה 'Bride'), laws of chastity to be observed in conjugal life; *Masseket Derek Erez* (מסכת דרך ארץ), 'Manners' and behavior of the different classes of society on various occasions. The tractate exists in two recensions, a longer (רבה) and a shorter one (זוטא). The larger, dealing almost exclusively with the rules of life prescribed for the 'disciples of the wise,' is of a very spiritual nature. Lastly we have to note here the other tractates edited by Kirchheim, including, besides those mentioned above, the tractates dealing with the laws relating to *Zizit* (ציצית), 'Fringes' (Num. 15.38); '*Abadim*

(עבדים), 'Slaves'; *Kutim* (כותים), 'Samaritans'; and *Gerim* (גרים), 'Proselytes.'

The works recorded thus far, though containing occasional hermeneutical elements, convey, owing to their scantiness and the long intervals at which they occur, but a faint idea of the interpretatory work of the *Tannaim*. For this we must turn to the earlier *Midrash*, which has come down to us in the following works: the *Mekilta* (מכילתא), "Measure," on a portion of Exodus; the *Sifre* (ספרי), the 'Books,' on portions of Numbers and the whole of Deuteronomy, both *Midrashim* emanating from the school of Ishmael; and the *Sifra* (ספרא) or *Torat Kohanim* (תורת כהנים), 'The Book' or 'The Law of the Priests,' on Leviticus, a product of the school of R. Akiba. Besides these fairly complete works we also possess fragments of a *Mekilta* of R. Simeon b. Yohai on Exodus, and of a small *Sifre* (ספרי זוטא) on Numbers, both originating in the school of R. Akiba; and of a *Mekilta* on Deuteronomy coming from the school of R. Ishmael.[14]

The exegetical system of the Rabbis, forming the basis of the *Midrash*, grew with the rise of the new schools, the seven hermeneutical rules of Hillel having been developed by R. Ishmael into thirteen, and expanded (particularly as regards their application in the department of *Haggadah*) by R. Eliezer, the son of R. Jose of Galilee, into thirty-two or thirty-three rules; whilst rules of interpretation of other distinguished Rabbis are also mentioned. The practical object of the *Midrash* was the deduction of new *Halakot* from the Scriptures,

or the finding of a 'support' (אסמכתא) for the old ones. It is very difficult to determine in which cases the *Midrash* preceded the *Halakah*, and in which cases the *Halakah* preceded the *Midrash*, but it may be safely assumed that in most cases where the interpretation of the Rabbis is forced and far-fetched the *Halakah* was first handed down by tradition as an ancient usage or custom, and the Biblical 'support' was invoked only to give it the weight of Scripture authority. Here are one or two instances which, given in the language of the Rabbis, may convey some idea of the vivid style of the *Midrash:*

'R. Ishmael, R. Eliezer b. Azariah, and R. Akiba were walking on the high-road, and Levi ha-Sadar and R. Ishmael the son of R. Eliezer b. Azariah were walking behind them. And then the following question was put before them: "Whence is it to be inferred that danger of life 'removes' the Sabbath?"... R. Jose of Galilee answered: "It is written: BUT (אך) *My Sabbath ye shall keep* (Exod. 31.13); the (limiting particle) אך teaches, there are Sabbaths which thou keepest, others which thou 'removest' (the latter in case of danger of life)." R. Simeon b. Manasya says: "Behold Scripture says: *And ye shall keep the Sabbath, for it is holy unto* YOU (*ibid.* v.14.), the Sabbath is given to you (with stress on the word לכם) to desecrate in case of need, but you are not given to the Sabbath" ' (*Mekilta, ad loc.*). Other Rabbis base this *Halakah* on the logical principle of *a fortiori* (קל וחומר, one of the hermeneutical rules of Hillel), but none disputes the *Halakah* in itself, which had evidently the authority of ages.

Another instance is the interpretation of Exod. 21.24 (cf. Lev. 24.60): '*Eye for eye*, that is, money (amounting to the value of the eye). Thou sayest money, perhaps it means the real eye (*i. e.* that his eye should be blinded in retaliation for the organ which he has destroyed). R. Eliezer said: "It is written: *And he that killeth a beast he shall restore, and he that killeth a man shall be put to death* (Lev. 24.21). The Scripture has thus put together damages caused to a man and those caused to a beast. As the latter may be atoned for by paying (the damages), so can also the former (except in cases of murder) be punished with money"' (*Sifra* Lev., *ad loc.*; *Mekilta*, *ad loc.*; *Baba Kamma* 83*b*).

This argument, called הקש (analogy of matter), is in direct opposition to the literal sense of the Scriptures, which implies the *jus talionis* in unmistakable terms; but it was only meant to lend some Biblical sanction to a *Halakah* that had been a controverted point between the Sadducees and the Pharisees for centuries before. It is different, when we read, for instance, with regard to the law, *And the land shall keep Sabbath to the Lord* (Lev. 25.2): 'One might think that it is also forbidden to dig pits, canals, and caves (this being a disturbance of the land) in the sabbatical year, therefore we have an inference to say: *Thou shalt neither sow thy field nor prune thy vineyard* (*ibid.* v.44), proving that it is only work connected with vineyard and field that is forbidden.' In instances like this, where the interpretation has nothing forced or strange about it, it would not be too risky to assume that the *Halakah* was the outcome of the *Midrash*.

But it is not such mere practical questions that have produced the vast *Midrash* literature. A great portion of it is simple commentary, though sometimes reproduced in that vivid dialogue style which makes it appear *Midrash*-like. *E.g.*, *And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop and shall dip it in the blood that is* בסף (Exod. 12.22), on which the *Mekilta* (*ad loc.*) has the following comment: 'The Scriptures tell us that he carves out a hole on the side of the threshold over which he kills (the Passover lamb); for סף means simply the threshold, as it is said: *In their setting of their thresholds by my threshold* (בספם את ספי, Ezek. 43.8, comp. LXX and Vulg.). This is the opinion of R. Ishmael. R. Akiba says סף means nothing else but a vessel, as it is said, *the bowls* (ספים), *the snuffers, the basins*' (I Kings 7.50, comp. Aramaic versions and commentaries).

Another example may be taken from the expression וינזרו *from the holy things of the children of Israel* (Lev. 22.2) on which the *Sifra* comments: 'נזירה (a noun, derived from וינזרו) means nothing else but separation. And so he says: *which separateth himself from Me* וינזר (Ezek. 14.7), and he says again: *They separated backwards* (נזרו Is. I.4)' Such instances of mere פשט (simple meaning) could be cited by hundreds, and it is not impossible that many more were omitted by the scribes, who considered such renderings of words and definitions of terms as universally known through the medium of the various versions, and hence not sufficiently important to be copied.[15]

In the haggadic portions of the *Midrash* the

elements of simple exegesis are less prominent—a fact which is easily explained by their subjective character. Sometimes the interpreter or preacher is so deeply convinced of the truth of the lesson he has to teach that he feels no compunction in interweaving it with Biblical facts, and putting it into the mouth of a Biblical hero. Thus we read in the *Sifra* with reference to Lev. 9.6: *This is the thing which ye shall do.* 'Moses said unto Israel: *Do* remove the *evil desire* (יצר הרע) from your hearts. Be all in awe and of one counsel to worship before the Omnipresent. As he is the Sole One in the world, so shall your service be single hearted, as it is said: *Circumcise the foreskin of your heart, for the Lord your God is the God of gods and the Lord of lords* (Deut. 10.16,17), and *then the glory of the Lord shall appear unto you* (Lev. 9.6).' The thought expressed in this interpretation is that the manifestation of the divine glory is the reward for the fulfilment of a commandment, and is sure to occur whenever Israel fulfills the laws of the Torah in true devotion and single-heartedness of spirit.

Occasionally the preacher in his enthusiasm leaves the text altogether and rushes off into a sort of hymn, as, for instance (Exod. 15.1), *I will praise God*, on which the *Mekilta* (*ad loc.*): 'I will give praise to God that He is mighty... that He is wealthy...that He is wise...that He is merciful...that He is a judge...that He is faithful.' Each attribute is followed by a proof from Scripture, and the whole is a paraphrase of 1 Chron. 29.11,12. The constant citing of parallel passages by way of

illustration is a main feature of the *Midrash*, *e.g.* *Sifre* on Num. 15.39: '*And ye shall not seek after your own heart and your own eyes* עיניכם: By this latter is meant adultery, as it is said: And Samson said to his father, *Get* her for me, for she is pleasing to *my eyes*' (בעיני, Jud. 14.3). Again Deut. 6.5: 'And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with *all thy heart and with all thy soul*,' where the *Sifre* adds by way of comment: 'Even if He should take away thy soul. And so he (the Psalmist, 44.22) says: *Yea, for Thy sake are we killed all the day long*.' The great exegetical principle was, 'The words of the Torah are poor (or deficient) in one place but rich in another, as it is said: *She is like the merchant's ship; she bringeth her food from afar*' (Prov. 31.14; Yerushalmi, Rosh ha-Shanah 58*d*).

IV. The *Amoraim* אמוראים 'Speakers', 'Interpreters'; a designation commonly applied to the authorities who flourished 220-500, and whose main activity consisted in expounding the *Mishnah*. The seats of learning were no longer confined to Palestine, great schools having arisen, as in the time of the *Tannaim*, in various places in Babylonia, destined even to overshadow the former. The Babylonian teachers (who received ordination) bear as a rule the title *Rab* (רב) in contradistinction to their Palestinian brethren who were called *Rabbi* (רבי). The most important among the *Amoraim* are the following:

First Generation (220-280).—(*a*) Palestine: R. Yannai, of whom we have a saying in the Mishnah; R. Hiyya and R. Hosha'ya Rabba, the supposed com-

pilers of the *Tosefta* (see above); R. Joshua b. Levi, the subject of many legends, to whom various mystical treatises (descriptions of paradise and hell, etc.) are attributed; R. Johanan (b. Nappaha) of Sepphoris and Tiberias, disciple of R. Judah and the most prominent teacher in Palestine during the third century, and his brother-in-law R. Simeon b. Lakish. (*b*) *Babylon:* Abba Arika ('Long Abba'), commonly cited by his title *Rab.* He 'went up' (from Babylon) to Palestine together with his uncle R. Hiyya (mentioned above) to study under R. Judah, and on his return founded at Sura the school over which he presided; Samuel ירחינאה (the astronomer), a relative of Rab, and, like him, a disciple of R. Judah (though he did not receive ordination from him). He became head of the school in Nehardea.

Second Generation (280-300).—(*a*) *Palestine:* R. Eleazar b. Pedat, R. Simlai, R. Assi (also Issi), R. Ammi (also Immi), and R. Abahu. The first four emigrated to Palestine from Babylon; whilst R. Abahu, who was a native of Palestine, taught in Cæsarea, where he often had controversies with Christian teachers. The famous *Haggadist* R. Samuel b. Nahmani also belongs to this generation. (*b*) *Babylon:* R. Huna (Sura), R. Jehuda (b. Ezekiel), founder of the school of Pumbeditha; R. Hisda, R. Sheshet, founder of a school in Shilhi. All of these were disciples of Rab and Samuel, or of one of them.

Third Generation (320-370).—This period marks the decay of the schools in Palestine, a consequence

of the religious persecutions inaugurated under the reign of Constantine. (*a*) *Palestine:* Jeremiah, R. Jonah, and R. Jose. (*b*) *Babylon:* Rabbah (רבה) b. Nahmani (Pumbeditha), famous for his dialectical skill and called 'the mountain-mover'; his colleague R. Joseph, a great authority on *Targum*, whose wide acquaintance with all branches of the Law brought him the title of 'Sinai'; their pupils 'Abayi and Raba (רבא), both famous for the ingenious methods exemplified in their controversies scattered all over the Babylonian *Talmud*; R. Papa, founder of a school in Nares.

Fourth Generation (375-427).—(*a*) *Palestine:* R. Samuel (b. Jose b. R. Bun); (*b*) *Babylon:* R. Ashi (Sura); R. Kahana II (Pumbeditha), and Amemar (Neharde'a). The former is credited with having begun the compilation of the Babylonian *Talmud*.

Fifth Generation (427-500).—*Babylon:* Mar bar R. Ashi; Rabbina (contraction of Rab Abina, Sura), and Rabbah Tosfaah (Pumbeditha). The two latter were greatly instrumental in accomplishing the work commenced by R. Ashi, finishing the compilation of the Babylonian *Talmud*, and reducing it to writing.

The literary productions of these two schools are largely embodied in the two *Talmuds* bearing the title of their native countries: (*A*) PALESTINIAN TALMUD, called the *Talmud* of Jerusalem, ת' ירושלמי, which is also more correctly called (since there were no schools in Jerusalem after the destruction of the Temple) ת' ארץ ישראל, ת' דמערבא, and גמרא דבני מערבא 'the *Talmud* of (the children of) the Land of Israel,'

'the *Talmud* (or the *Gemara*) of (the people of) the West.' (*B*) The BABYLONIAN TALMUD ת' בבלי, which was also known under the title (though only occurring once) of ת' אנשי מזרח 'the *Talmud* of the people of the East. [16]

The main object of the *Talmuds* is the interpretation of the *Mishnah*, tracing its source, giving its reasons, explaining obscure passages, as well as real or seeming contradictions, by the aid of parallel passages in the 'external *Mishnahs*,' and illustrating its matter and expanding its contents (especially in the branches of civil law) by giving such cases as life and altered circumstances were constantly furnishing. It is perhaps in this latter quality that the text of the Talmud proper as distinguished from the *Mishnah* is called *Gemara* גמרא, meaning, according to some authorities, 'Supplement' or 'Complement' to the *Mishnah*.[17] The *Talmuds* differ in various minor respects. Thus, the non-Hebrew portions of the Jerusalem *Talmud* are composed in the West Aramaic dialect, whilst those of the Babylonian *Talmud* are written in an East Aramaic idiom, closely related to the Syriac and still more akin to the Mandaic language.

The style of the Jerusalem *Talmud* is more concise, its discussions less diffuse, than those of the Babylonian *Talmud*. The former is altogether free from the casuistic and lengthy discourses on imaginary cases which form a special feature of the productions of the Eastern Rabbis. It should, however, be remarked that, so far as dialect and diction are concerned, the Babylonian *Talmud* is not always uniform, there being various tractates, such as *Nedarim*, *Nazir*, *Temura*, *Me'ilah*,

and *Keritot*, which betray certain grammatical forms and peculiarities of style, reminding us in some places of the diction of the *Talmud* of Jerusalem.

Apart from the main object as described, the text of the *Mishnah* serves sometimes (particularly in the Babylonian *Talmud*) as a mere peg on which to fasten matter having hardly any connection with the contents of the latter. *E.g.* the lines in *Mishnah* tractate *Gittin*, 'that the laws regarding the σικαριοι (a name under which certain leaders of the Zealot bands were known) did not apply to the land of Judea,' are followed in the Babylonian *Talmud* by a legendary account of the wars preceding the destruction of the second Temple, and various incidents connected with it, extending over more than five folio pages (55*b*-58*a*). Again in the tractate *Baba Batra*, the accidental remark in the *Mishnah*, that a volume (or roll) containing the Scriptures inherited by two or more must not be divided among them by cutting it up into its constituent books even when the parties agree to this, provokes in the *Gemara* (of the Babylonian Talmud) a discussion relating to the arrangement of the Canon of the Old Testament, its rise, and the dates at which the various books included in it were composed, accompanied by a long discourse on the particular nature of the Book of Job, the character and date of its hero, together with a few remarks on other Biblical personages, which covers nearly 8 folio pages (13b–17a).

This process of inserting matter but slightly connected with the text is at times carried further by adding to the inserted matter other topics hav-

ing a similar slight connection with it. As an instance of this process we may regard the following. *Mishnah Berakot*, 9. 1, runs: 'He who sees a place in which miracles were performed for the sake of Israel says: Praised be He who wrought miracles for our fathers in this place.' By way of illustration the *Gemara* (Babylonian *Talmud ibid.* 54*a*) cites an 'external *Mishnah*' in which it is taught that 'he who sees the crossing of the Red Sea (*i.e.* the place at which the Jews crossed the Red Sea, Exod. 14.22), or the crossing of the Jordan (Jos 34.14ff.)...is bound to give thanks and praise to the Omnipresent' (*Makom*).

These last words suggest a quotation of R. Judah in the name of Rab, adding to the number of those who are under the obligation to give thanks also the four cases enumerated in Ps. 107 (people returning from a sea voyage, coming back from a journey through the desert, recovering from a serious illness, or released from prison, 54*b*). This statement is followed by several other sayings (54*b*, 55*a*), which have no other connection with the preceding matter than identity of authorship, all being cited in the name of *Rab*. One of these citations is to the effect that for three things man should in particular pray to God (who alone can grant them): 'a good king, a good year, and a good dream' (55*b*); but the last word again suggests a new train of thought on the subject of dreams, their interpretation and fulfilment, which forms the theme of the next 6 folio pages (55a-57b).

Owing to these sudden and violent changes

from subject to subject the style of the *Talmud* becomes very uncertain and rather rambling;[18] but on the other hand, it is this very circumstance that keeps the 'sea of the *Talmud*' in constant motion, relieving it from the monotony and tedious repetition so peculiar to the majority of theological works dating from those early ages. Indeed owing to this facility for dragging in whatever interested the compilers or the scribes, the *Talmud* almost loses the character of a work of divinity, and assumes more the character of an encyclopedia, reproducing the knowledge of the Rabbis during the first five centuries on all possible subjects, whether secular or religious. This is, as already indicated, particularly the case with the Babylonian *Talmud*, the *Haggadah* of which is very discursive and rich in all sorts of folk-lore. It must, however, be borne in mind that the authorities in whose names the strangest stories are sometimes communicated are often Rabbis from Palestine, whose sayings and statements were as much studied and discussed in the East as they were in the West.

V. The *Saborai*, סבוראי 'Explainers' or 'Meditators' (upon the words of their predecessors), whose activity is supposed to have extended over the whole of the sixth century. The most important among them are Rabbi Jose (Pumbeditha) and R. Ahai (of Be-Hathim), who flourished about the beginning of the sixth century, and probably shared largely in the compilation work of the last of the Amoraim; and R. Giza (Sura) and R. Simona (Pum-

beditha), who belonged to the middle of the same century. The activity of the Saborai, about whose lives we know little, consisted mainly in commenting upon the *Talmud* by means of explanatory glosses and contributing to it some additional controversies marked by peculiarity of style and by absence of the names of those engaged in the dialogue, as well as by insertions of final decisions upon the differing opinions of their predecessors.[19]

The school of the *Saborai* is peculiar to Babylon, there being no corresponding class of teachers in Palestine. Nor is there any reliable tradition regarding the compilation of the Jerusalem *Talmud*, by whom it was accomplished, and when it was undertaken. Maimonides' statement, that R. Johanan composed the Jerusalem *Talmud*, can, since this work contains quantities of matter dating from a much later period, mean only that by the aid of the schools he founded, this Rabbi was largely instrumental in giving rise to a work embodying the teachings of the later Western authorities. But in consequence of religious persecutions and political disturbances the decay of the schools set in too early to permit even such comparative completeness and finish as are to be found in the Babylonian *Talmud*, which is itself far from perfection in this respect.

Indeed the abruptness of the discussions of the Palestinian *Talmud*, the frequent absence of formulæ introducing quotations or marking the beginning of the treatment of a fresh subject or the conclusion of an old one, as well as the meagerness of its matter

where the analogy of the Babylonian *Talmud* would suggest the greatest fulness, and the fact that it has no *Gemara* at all on the fifth order (sacrifices), which is so strongly represented in the Babylonian *Talmud*[20]— all these circumstances convey the impression that the Jerusalem *Talmud* was never submitted to a real, conscious compilation with the object of presenting posterity with a completed work. What was reduced to writing does not give us a work carried out after a preconcerted plan, but rather represents a series of jottings answering to the needs of the various individual writers, and largely intended to strengthen the memory. And thus lacking the authority enjoyed by the *Mishnah* and the Babylonian *Talmud*, which were the products of the great centres of learning, the Jerusalem *Talmud* was, for a long time at least, not elevated to the rank of a national work, and it is therefore easy to understand how such portions of it as had not much bearing upon actual practice were permitted to disappear.

Altogether, the people of Palestine were, as an old Rabbi said, 'sick with oppression,' and had no time to spare for the niceties of the *Halakah*, 'and did not listen to the words of *Talmud* (in the narrower sense of discussing the legal portions of it) and the *Mishnah*.' The deeper was their devotion to the *Haggadah*, which gave them 'words of blessing and consolation.' This will account for the copiousness of the *haggadic* literature, which reaches its highest development during the period of the *Amoraim*. This literature is embodied in the *Midrashim* to various books of the

Bible as well as in certain independent haggadic treatises, the contents of which, though possibly compiled at a later age, are made up of the homilies and moralizing exhortations given in the names of the same Palestinian Rabbis who figure as authorities in the two *Talmuds*. They, however, form a literature by themselves, never having served as sources or factors of the *Talmud*, though they are sometimes useful as parallel passages to the haggadic portions of the latter. They thus do not fall within the scope of this article.

It is, however, only fair to warn the theologian that though he may dispense, for example, with the *Pesikta* (collection of homilies mainly based on the *Haftarot*) or the *Midrash Shir ha-Shirim* (allegoric interpretations of the Song of Songs) in his study of the Talmud, he cannot do so safely in his study of the Rabbi, whose performance of his prophetic office is seen to best advantage in such moralizing works as those of which the *haggadic* pieces just mentioned are a fair specimen.

APPENDIX A

The Tractates of the Talmud

I. *Zeraim*, זרעים 'Seeds'

1. *Berakot*, ברכות 'Benedictions,' treating of laws and regulations relating to the liturgy. 9 chapters.

2. *Pea*, פאה 'Corner,' treating of the laws relating to the corner of the field and the forgotten sheaves, etc., to be left for the poor (Lev. 19.9, Deut. 24.9,21.) 8 chapters.

3. *Dammai*, דמי (also דמאי) the 'Doubtful,' respecting corn and other productions of the earth, of which it is doubtful whether the prescribed tithes had been paid. 7 chapters.

4. *Kil'ayim*, כלאים 'Mixtures,' *i. e.* mixtures of seeds, and materials for cloth, prohibited by the Scriptures (Lev. 19. 19, Deut. 22.9–11). 9 chapters.

5. *Shebi'it*, שביעית the 'Sabbatical year' (Exod. 23.11, Lev. 25.1ff, Deut 19.1ff). 10 chapters.

6. *Terumot*, תרומות 'Heave-Offerings' for the priest (Num. 18.8ff, and Deut. 18.4). 5 chapters.

7. *Ma'aserot*, מעשרות 'Tithes' (Num. 18.21ff). 5 chapters.

8. *Ma'aser Sheni*, מעשר שני 'Second Tithe' (Deut. 14.22ff). 5 chapters.

9. *Hallah*, חלה the 'Dough,' a portion thereof to be given to the priest (Num. 15.18ff). 4 chapters.

10. '*Orlah*, ערלה 'Uncircumcised,' fruits of the tree during the first three years (Lev. 19.23ff). 3 chapters.

11. *Bikkurim*, בכורים 'First Fruits,' brought to the Temple (Deut. 26.1ff, Exod. 23.19). 3 chapters.

II. *Mo'ed*, מועד 'Season.'

1. *Shabbat*, שבת 'Sabbath,' laws relating to it, mainly prohibitions of work (Exod. 20.10 etc). 24 chapters.

2. '*Erubin*, עירובין 'Amalgamations' or ideal combination of localities with the purpose of extending the Sabbath boundary, as well as laws concerning the Sabbath day's journey. 10 chapters.

3. Pesahim, פסחים 'Passovers,' laws relating to them (Exod. 12.1ff, Lev. 23.4, Num. 9.1ff). 10 chapters.

4. *Shekalim*, שקלים 'Shekels,' collected for the Tmeple (Exod. 30.12ff, Neh. 10.33), and the various objects for which they were spent; including lists of the higher officials of the Temple. 8 chapters.

5. *Yoma*, יומא 'The Day,' (also *Yom ha-Kippurim*, יום הכפורים 'The Day of Atonement'), treating of the service in the Temple on that day, and of the laws relating to fasting (Lev. 16.1). 8 chapters.

6. *Sukkah*, סוכה 'Booth' or 'Tabernacle,' respecting the laws on dwelling in booths for seven days and other observances during this feast (Lev. 23.34, Num. 29. 12ff). 8 chapters.

7. *Bezah*, ביצה 'Egg' (so called after the first words with which the tractate begins, but also termed *Yom Tob*, יום טוב 'Feast'), enumerating the different kinds of work permitted or prohibited on festivals (Exod.12. 10). 5 chapters.

8. *Rosh ha-Shanah*, שרא השנה 'New Year,' dealing with questions relating to the calendar, but chiefly with the laws to be observed on the first of the seventh month (*Tishri*), the civil New Year of the Jews (see Lev. 23.24, Num. 29.1ff). 4 chapters.

9. *Ta'anit* תענית 'Fast,' respecting the laws observed and the order of the liturgy on such days. 4 chapters.

10. *Megillah*, מגלה 'Roll' of Esther, relating to the laws to be observed on the feast of *Purim*. 4 chapters.

11. *Mo'ed Katon*, מועד קטן 'Minor Feast' (also called *Mashkin*, משקין, the first word of the tractate), *i. e.* the laws relating to the days intervening between the first and the last days of the feast of Passover and that of Tabernacles. 4 chapters.

12. *Hagigah*, חגיגה 'Feast-Offering,' treating of the duty of pilgrimage to Jerusalem and the sort of sacrifices to be brought on such occasions (see Exod.23. 17 and Deut. 16.16), as well as of laws regarding the degrees of defilement (against which the pilgrims are cautioned). 3 chapters.

III. *Nashim*, נשים 'Women.'

1. *Yebamot*, יבמות 'Levirate Marriages' (Deut. 25. 5ff), and the forbidden degrees in marriage (Lev. 18, etc.). 16 chapters.

2. *Ketubot*, כתובות 'Marriage Deeds and Marriage Settlements' (see Exod. 22.16). 13 chapters.

3. *Nedarim*, נדרים 'Vows,' and their annulment (Num. 30.3ff). 11 chapters.

4. *Nazir*, נזיר 'Nazirite' (Num. 6.2ff). 9 chapters.

5. *Sotah*, סוטה 'The Suspected Woman' (Num. 5.12ff). 9 chapters.

6. *Gittin*, גטין 'Letters of Divorce' (Deut. 24.1ff). 9 chapters.

7. *Kiddushin*, קידושין 'Betrothals.' 4 chapters.

IV. *Nezikin*, נזיקין 'Damages.'

1–3. *Baba Kamma*, בבא קמא 'First Gate'; *Baba Mezi'a* בבא מציעא 'Middle Gate'; *Baba Batra*, בבא בתרא 'Last Gate.' These formed in ancient times only one tractate, bearing the same title as the whole order מסכת נזיקין 'Tractate of Damages,' divided into three sections, each section consisting of 10 chapters. These three treat of (1) damages and injuries caused by man and beasts for which he is responsible (see Exod. 21. 18ff, 22. 3ff); (2) of laws concerning lost property, trusts, the prohibition of usury, and similar matters, duties towards hired labourers, etc. (see Exod. 22, 6ff; 23.3,4; Lev. 19. 13; 25. 14, 36; Deut.; 20. 23; 25 and 24. 14); (3) laws relating to the different ways of taking possession of various kinds of property, the right of pre-emption, definition of certain terms used in contracts and oral transactions, order of inheritance (see Num. 27.6ff), etc. 30 chapters.

4. 5. *Sanhedrin*, סנהדרין (10 chapters), and *Makkot*

מכות 'Stripes' (3 chapters), also forming in ancient times one tractate. The former treats of the constitution of the various courts of justice and their modes of procedure, the examinations of witnesses, and the four kinds of capital punishment for grave crimes, as well as the punishment consisting in being excluded from eternal life, etc., etc. The latter deals with offences for which the infliction of 39 stripes is prescribed (Deut. 25. 2ff), false witnesses (Deut. 19. 16ff), and the laws relating to the cities of refuge (Num. 35.10ff, Deut. 19.2ff.). 13 chapters.

6. *Shebu'ot*, שבועות 'Oaths,' taken in private or administered by the court (Lev. 5.14). 6 chapters.

7. *'Eduyyot*, עדיות 'Evidences,' containing a collection of laws and decisions gathered from the statements made by distinguished authorities. 8 chapters.

8. *'Abodah Zarah*, עבודה זרה 'Idolatry,' regarding the treatment of idols and their worshippers (Deut. 4. 25ff). 5 chapters.

9. *Abot*, אבות 'Fathers' (of Jewish tradition), containing mostly ethical sayings and maxims of the Tannaim. 5 chapters.

10. *Horayot*, הוריות 'Decisions' (wrong ones) given by the authorities, treating of the sacrifices to be brought if the public acted in accordance with such erroneous teachings (Lev. 4. 1ff). 3 chapters.

V. Kodashim, קדשים 'Sacred' things.

1. *Zebahim*, זבחים 'Sacrifices' (also called שחיטת קדשים and קרבנות), treating of the laws relating to the

various modes of offering, the sprinkling of the blood the burning of the fat pieces or of the whole animal, etc. (Lev. 1.1ff). 12 chapters.

2. *Menahot*, מנחות 'Meal-Offerings,' including also the laws regarding libations (Lev. 2.5ff etc., Num. 15.3ff). 12 chapters.

3. *Hullin*, חולין (also שחיטת חולין) 'Things Secular,' regarding the mode of killing animals and birds for ordinary use, as well as the various diseases disqualifying them from being eaten, and many other dietary laws. 12 chapters.

4. *Bekorot*, בכורות 'First-born,' of men and animals (Exod. 13.2, 12ff, etc.), including also the laws regarding the tithes of animals (Lev. 27.26,32ff). 9 chapters.

5. *'Arakin*, ערכין 'Valuations,' of persons and things dedicated to the Temple (Lev. 27.2), also including some laws relating to the year of Jubilee (Lev. 25.15ff). 9 chapters.

6. *Temurah*, תמורה 'Change,' the laws bearing on cases of substituting a secular animal for one already dedicated to the altar (Lev.27.9,33). 7 chapters.

7. *Keritot*, כריתות 'Excisions,' treating of sins subject to punishment of 'the soul being cut off' (Gen. 17. 14, Exod. 12.1) etc., etc. 56 chapters.

8. *Me'ilah* מעילה 'Trespass' treating of sacrilege committed by secularizing things belonging to the Temple or to the altar (Lev. 5.15ff). 8 chapters.

9. *Tamid*, תמיד 'Continual' sacrifice, describing

the Temple service in connection with this daily sacrifice (Exod. 29. 38ff, Num. 28.3ff). 7 chapters.

10. *Middot*, מדות 'Measurements,' of the Temple, describing its courts, halls, chambers, and gates, etc. etc. 5 chapters.

11. *Kinim*, קנים 'Nests,' of birds, or pairs of doves brought as sacrifice by the poor, (Lev. 1.14ff 5.7ff.) 3 chapters.

VI. Tohorot, טהרות 'Purifications.'

1. *Kelim*, כלים 'Vessels,' furniture, garments, and all kinds of utensils subject to Levitical impurity (Lev. 11.32). 30 chapters.

2. *Ohalot*, אהלות 'Tents' and habitations as conductors of Levitical impurity (Num. 19.14ff). 18 chapter .

3. *Nega'im*, נגעים 'Leprosy,' in all its various degrees (Lev. 13–14). 14 chapters.

4. *Parah*, פרה 'Red Heifer,' the use made of its ashes for the purpose of purification (Num. 19.2ff). 12 chapters.

5. *Tohorot*, טהרות 'Purifications,' used euphemistically for טומאות, 'defilements' of all sorts and their various degrees. 10 chapters.

6. *Mikwa'ot*, מקואות 'Wells' and cisterns to be used as means of ritual purification (Lev. 15.11,12 etc. etc.). 10 chapters.

7. *Niddah*, נדה the 'Menstruous,' the Levitical impurity attaching to women under certain physical conditions (Lev. 15.19ff). 10 chapters.

8. *Makshirin*, מכשירין 'Preparers,' respecting the conditions under which certain articles became (by coming in contact with liquids) eligible for eventual defilement (Lev. 11.37ff). 6 chapters.

9. *Zabim*, זבים 'Persons afflicted with running issues,' the impurity arising there from (Lev. 15.2ff). 5 chapters.

10. *Tebul Yom*, טבול יום 'Immersed during the day', *i. e.* the conditions of a person who had taken the ritual bath prescribed but has still to wait for sunset to be considered as quite pure (see Lev. 22.6,7). 4 chapters.

11. *Yadayim*, ידים 'Hands,' respecting the ritual impurity attaching to them (according to the Oral Law), and the mode of cleansing them by pouring water over them. 4 chapters.

12. *'Ukzin*, עוקצין 'Stalks,' how far they are considered a part of the fruit so as to convey impurity when touched by anything unclean. 3 chapters.

APPENDIX B

Literature

Editions: There are very few critical editions of the ancient Rabbinical literature, though new reprints are constantly appearing. The following, however, deserve special notice:—*Mishna*, Naples, 1492, ed. pr.; *Mishna . . . Latinitate donavit . . .* J. Surenhusius, Amstelod., 1698; *The Mishna, edited from a unique MS*, by W. H. Lowe, Cambridge, 1883; *Mishnayoth: Hebräischer Text mit Punktation, Deutscher Übersetzung*, von A. Samter, Berlin, 1887 (not yet finished). Most editions have, as a rule, the commentaries of 'Obadya di Bertinoro and of Yom Tob Lipman Heller (תוספות יום טוב), or the commentary of Maimonides (not as frequently as the two former). [Best edition with numerous commentaries, especially the one by Solomon Adeni, Wilna, 1908-9]. As useful editions for students, the tractates edited by Strack may be recommended. *Tosephta*, edited by Zuckermandel (after MSS), Pasewalk, 1880. *Jerus. Talmud*, Venice, 1523, ed. pr., Krotoschin, 1866, and Zitomir, 1860-67. [Wilna, 1922]. The last editions have several commentaries. Of single tractates there have appeared, among others, *Berakhoth*, *Pea*, and *Demai*, with the commentary *Ahabath Zion*, by Z. Frankel, and a part of *Baba Kamma* with a commentary by I. Lewy. *Bab. Talmud*, Venice, 1520, with the com-

mentaries of R. Solomon b. Isaac, and the *Glosses* of the Franco-German Rabbis called *Tosaphoth* (Additions). The last and best edition of the Talmud is that which appeared in Wilna, 1880-86, 25 vols. The *Variæ lectiones in Mischnam et in Talmud Babylonicum*, by Raph. Rabbinowicz, consisting of 16 vols., and extending over a large part of the Bab. Talmud, is a most important work for the critical study of the Talmud. Also to be consulted is the work קונטרס למלאות חסרונות הש"ס, Königsberg, 1860, restoring the words and passages omitted or corrupted by the censors. Of single tractates we have only to notice here the *Tract. Makkoth*, ed. Friedmann, Wien, 1888.[21]

Introductory and Bibliographical: N. Krochmal מורה נבוכי הזמן, Lemberg, 1851 (Heb.); L. Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, Frankfurt-a.-M. 1892; M. Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, §§ 1–7, London, 1857; Z. Frankel, דרכי המשנה, *Hodegetica in Mischnam* . . . Lipsiæ, 1859 (Heb.); by the same, מבוא הירושלמי, *Introductio in Talmud Hierosolomitanum*, Breslau, 1870 (Heb.); Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vols. 3 and 4 (Germ.); Dérenbourg, *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine d'après les Thalmuds et les autres sources rabbiniques* (Paris, 1867); I. H. Weiss, דור דור ודורשיו *Zur Geschichte der Jüdischen Tradition*, vols. 1-3; [I. Halevy דורות הראשונים *Geschichte und Literatur Israels* Ic, e, II-III, Frankfurt a. M., 1898-1918 (Heb.)] Strack, *Einleitung in den Thalmud*, Leipzig, 1894 [Munich 1921]; M. Mielziner, *Introduction to the Talmud*, Cincinnati, 1894; Schürer, *GJV*, i. § 3 E, Leipzig, 1890 [1901] (Germ.). For

popular accounts see E. Deutsch, *The Talmud*, Philadelphia, 1896; A. Darmesteter, *The Talmud*, Philadelphia, 1897.

DICTIONARIES AND GRAMMARS: Nathan b. Yehiel (of the 11th cent.), ספר הערוך, 1480, ed. pr. This work was last edited or rather incorporated in the *Arukh Completum . . . auctore Nathane filio Jechielis . . . corrigit explevit critice* Alex. Kohut, 8 vols., Wien, 1878-92; Joh. Buxtorf, *Lexicon Chaldaicum Talmudicum et Rabbinicum*, Basel, 1640; Jacob Levy, *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*, Leipzig, 1876; M. Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Jerushalmi*, London and New York, 1886; Sam. Krauss, *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch, und Targum . . .* Berlin, 1898; W. Bacher, *Die älteste Terminologie der jüdischen Schriftauslegung: Ein Wörterbuch der bibelexegetischen Kunstsprache der Tannaiten*, Leipzig, 1899; [II *Die Bibel und Traditions-Geschichtliche Terminologie der Amoräer*, Leipzig, 1905]. H. L. Strack and C. Siegfried, *Lehrbuch der Neuhebräischen Sprache . . .* Karlsruhe and Leipzig, 1884; A. Geiger, *Lehr-und Lesebuch der Sprache der Mishnah*, Breslau, 1845 (Germ.); I. H. Weiss, משפט לשון המשנה, Wien, 1865 (Heb.); [K. Albrecht, *Neuhebräische Grammatik auf Grund der Mischna*, München, 1913 (Germ.)]. G. Dalman, *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch*, Leipzig, 1894 [1905] (Germ.); S. D. Luzzatto, *Elementi grammaticali del . . . dialetto Talmudico Babilonese*, Padua, 1865 (Ital.), of which a Germ. tr. was prepared by M. S. Krüger, and was published in

Breslau, 1873; Levias, *Grammar of the Bab. Talm.*, Cincinnati, 1900. [Max L. Margolis, *Manual of the Aramaic Language of the Babylonian Talmud*, Munich, 1910].

The attempts towards translating the Talmud are many and various. A full account of them will be found in Dr. Erich Bischoff's *Kritische Geschichte der Thalmud-Ubersetzungen aller Zeiten und Zungen*, Frankfurt-a.-M. 1899 (Germ.). The present writer can, however, recommend only the following books: On the Mishna see above. On Minor tractates: *Masecheth Sopherim*, by J. Müller, Leipzig, 1878; *Derech Erez Suta*, by A. Iawrogy, Königsberg, 1885. Jerus. Talm.: A. Wünsche, *Der jerusalemische Talmud in seinen haggadischen Bestandtheilen ins Deutsche übertragen*, Zürich, 1880. Bab. Talm.: [*Tractate Berakot*, by A. Cohen, Cambridge, 1921]. *A Translation of the treatise Chagigah*, by A. W. Streane, 1891; *Tractate Baba Mezia mit deutscher Ubersetzung* . . . by A. Samter, Berlin, 1876; *Der Bab. Talmud in seinen Hagadischen Bestandtheilen wortgetreu ubersetzt*, by Wünsche, 1888. The student would do well to consult always, when reading a *Haggadic* text, the following standard works by W. Bacher: *Die Agada der Babylonischen Amoräer*, Strassburg, 1879; *Die Agada der Tannaiten*, Strassburg, 1884; *Die Agada der Palästinischen Amoräer*, Strassburg, 1892.

NOTES OF LECTURES

ON JEWISH PHILANTHROPY

[The following pages contain notes of lectures on Jewish philanthropy delivered by Professor Schechter before the students of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America during 1914 and 1915—the last two years of his life. He delivered his first lecture on November 13, 1913, and continued rather irregularly, owing to ill health, during the following years, until November 19, 1915, when he gave his last lecture, only five hours before his death.

In his remarks introductory to this course of lectures, he expressed the hope that one of his pupils might some day write a book on the subject of Jewish Philanthropy. He was, however, so much impressed with the need and importance of such a work, that he began to collect material for the purpose of writing such a book himself. Accordingly, he spent much of his time during his last two years in collecting data on this subject from the Bible, Talmud, Midrash, and later literature. In addition to fragmentary collections of citations from these sources, he left a note-book of sixty-four pages, mostly in Hebrew, containing two hundred and fifty-six quotations and about one hundred and thirty-five references to passages relating to charity. Interspersed among these citations occasionally occur illuminating isolated phrases as well as a number of consecutive paragraphs written in English—containing his interpretations and conclusions.

Shortly after Professor Schechter's death, Rabbi Jacob Bosniak, his devoted pupil, carefully collated this note-book with notes of the lectures of Professor Schechter above referred to, taken by himself and some of his fel-

low-students at the Seminary. The following pages represent the fruits of Rabbi Bosniak's work, viz. the translation, wherever necessary, of Professor Schechter's notes and the rearrangement of the material presented in these notes in connection with the students' notes of the lectures as delivered at the Seminary.]

INTRODUCTION:

When the rabbi comes in touch with philanthropic and social institutions, he should be able to speak about them from a Jewish point of view. There are some people who think that charity is a product of Christianity. It is true that we have no orders such as "Brothers of Mercy" or "Sisters of Mercy", for celibacy is forbidden by Jewish law. We have no foundations and hospitals dating from the Middle Ages, for we were not allowed to obtain any landed property. Again, the monks living in cloisters kept records of all their acts of lovingkindness. And thus, having an enormous amount of literature on the subject, make a display of it. There are even encyclopedias of charity. A good book on the subject was written by Ulhorn, entitled *History of Christian Charity*. The author of that book was a protestant, and did not do justice to Roman Catholicism. So we have another book dealing with the charity of Roman Catholics by Ratzinger. Ulhorn begins with philanthropic institutions among pagans, and also has a chapter on Jewish charity—a subject which fared badly at his hands. His point of view was that everything centres in Jesus. He contends that Jewish charity, while superior to that of pagans, was infer-

ior to that of Christians. For it is the outcome of the Law, and is lacking in love. It is not *in* the Jew but *outside* of him. It is wanting in tenderness and delicacy, in ennobling and equalizing the poor, etc.

But the Christians never understood the spirit of the Law; and the notion one gets from Ulhorn's book is that the Jews published very little concerning their charitable work. Indeed, we have no real book on this subject.

We learn of Jewish charitable and philanthropic work in the Middle Ages from the responsa of that time. But in these sources no names of donors and testators are given. They generally speak of Reuben and Simon instead of the actual names of the parties concerned. They do not give the names of cities in which bequests were made. In all our literature, the records of the 'Hekdeshes' have not been preserved. Besides, many records and archives were lost, because of expulsions and persecutions. Another reason for our not having any wider knowledge of Jewish charitable work in those days is because the Jews were not then interested in keeping records of these things, nor was it a prominent topic of discussion among them. Very few rabbis occupied themselves with the study of Hilkot Zedakah: Jewish scholars were also too busy to bother with discussions on charity.

We have only one book entirely devoted to the study of philanthropy, *Me'il Zedakah* by R. Elijah Cohen. It is a collection of Biblical and Rabbinic passages dealing with the subject of charity. But unfortunately this book is wanting in proper order

and system; nor does the author make any attempt toward history and criticism. He also interrupts himself with homiletical remarks. In our halakic works we have all the laws about charity, but nothing of its history.[1]

In the following lectures we shall deal with: (1) Biblical institutions, *i. e.* institutions which are referred to in the Bible, according to Jewish interpretation. (2) Rabbinical institutions, i. e. institutions of Rabbinic times for which we have no authority in the Bible. (3) Medieval institutions.

Underlying Principles of Charity

(a) All Wealth Belongs to God.

The first underlying principle is that God is the real owner or proprietor of the land, and all wealth found thereon. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof," says the Psalmist.[2] The same idea is conveyed to the Rabbis by the declaration: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth".[3] "Give unto Him of what is His, since thou and what thou hast are His."[4] This is also found expressed by David who says: "For all things come of Thee and of thine own have we given Thee".[5] "If thou hast given charity, thou hast not given of thine own, but of His."[6] "Thou shalt not say: 'I have no money' (to give to the poor), for all the money belongs to Him,[7] as it is written: Mine is the silver and Mine is the gold, saith the Lord of hosts".[8] "Honour the Lord with thy substance",[9] is emended by the Rabbis so as to read: "Honour the Lord with what He has

graciously given to thee".[10] "Thou art My steward. If I gave thee aught, thou owest it to Me. Hence, give Me of My own."[11]

These are only a few examples of many similar passages found in our vast literature. The idea that God is the sole owner of everything we possess is current not only in the poetic portions, the Haggadah of the Bible, so to speak, or the homiletical interpretations of the Rabbis, but also forms a basis for many a civil and religious law. The Bible commands: "The land shall not be sold in perpetuity; for the land is Mine."[12] In the Babylonian Talmud we read: "If one set aside a purse for the Temple, and it was lost or stolen before it reached the proper hand of the authority, R. Johanan says that he must make good the loss by giving another purse to the Temple, while R. Simon ben Lakish is of the opinion that he is not responsible for the purse, because, wherever it might be, it is in the treasury of God."[13] The underlying principles of both opinions is that one is considered only the depository, or trustee, of money, which belongs to God.

The question in the Talmud is how far we should hold a person responsible for the money in his capacity as care-taker. From the Jerusalem Talmud we quote another law based on the same principle. "If the *Gizbar* gave a deposit on a purchase of movables for the Temple, the purchase was completed by this very act; and the movables become the property of the Temple, wherever they might be found. (A secular purchase is not completed until the actual transfer of the goods takes place.)

For it is written:[14] 'The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof.' "[15]

In religious law this idea forms the basis for the obligation of reciting a benediction and saying grace before and after meals. "One who enjoys of the good things of this world, without saying grace, is as though he robbed the Holy One, blessed be He".[16] The words of the Psalmist: "The wicked borroweth and payeth not,"[17] are explained by the Rabbis to refer to the Gentiles who eat and drink without saying grace.[18]

(b) Men Belong to God.

The second underlying principle is that man himself is the possession of God. In the words of the Psalmist: "The earth is the Lord's...the world and they that dwell therein".[19] In the words of the Rabbis: "For thou and what thou hast are His".[20] God's ownership of men is understood either in the sense that they are His servants or slaves, or that they are His children.

In Leviticus we read: "For unto Me the children of Israel are servants; they are My servants whom I have brought out of the land of Egypt".[21] "And if thy brother be waxen poor with thee and sell himself unto thee, thou shalt not make him to serve as a bondservant....For they are My servants, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt: they shall not be sold as bondmen".[22] According to the Rabbis God has a deed, so to speak, on Israel, which was drawn up at the very beginning of its history.[23]

Again, you know the answer given by R. Johanan

ben Zakkai to his pupils. They asked him: Why has the ear—of the slave who refused to be free at the end of seven years—been chosen to be bored,[24] in preference to any other part of his body? Answered R. Johanan, "His ear heard the voice of God from Mount Sinai: 'Thou shalt have no other gods before Me'; and now, he threw off the yoke of the kingdom of Heaven and received upon himself the yoke of a mortal. His ear heard before Mount Sinai: 'For unto Me the children of Israel are servants',[25] and now he went and bought for himself another master. Therefore, let his ear be bored, for he has not observed what his ear had heard".[26]

Another passage of the Bible reads: "Ye are the children of the Lord your God".[27] The context of this verse is halakic in character, and the meaning is that they are obliged to honor and obey the commandments of the Holy One, blessed be He, because they belong to Him. But this is rather a theolo gical subject. The point of interest to us here is the fact that all are "the children of the living God".[28]

Relation Between the Rich and the Poor

If all are the children of God, it follows that in their relation to one another they are brothers. And in this connection we note with interest, that, in most cases, when the Bible speaks of the poor man, or of one who was recently reduced to poverty, he is called "brother". "If thy brother be waxen poor, and sell some of his possession..."[29] "And if thy brother be waxen poor, and his means fail with thee

. . ."[30] ". . . . That thy brother may live with thee."[31] "And if thy brother be waxen poor with thee. . . ."[32] ". . . . nor shut thy hand from thy needy brother."[33] ". . . . and thy eye be evil against thy needy brother. . . ."[34] "Thou shalt surely open thine hand unto thy poor and needy brother. . . ."[35] "At the end of seven years ye shall let go every man his brother." ". . . . Ye lend upon pledge, every one to his brother."[37]

Thus, we see how the Bible emphasizes the fact that the poor is the brother, and consequently the equal, of the rich. To use the words of the Rabbis: "It is not written 'the poor man', but 'thy brother', to show that both of them are equal."[38]

Treatment of the Poor

It is evident that the purpose of accentuating the close relation between the rich and the poor was to secure for the latter a brotherly and loving treatment. Indeed, it is the gentle reception and sympathetic word that relieve and encourage the poor and the humble, as much as, or even more than, the giving of the coin. The Rabbis express it: "He who gives a Perutah to the poor man is blessed with *six* blessings, but he who encourages him with kind words is blessed with *eleven* blessings."[39] The poor man must by no means get the impression that one does not sympathize with his being in distress. If one is poor himself and cannot afford to give anything to him who applies for charity, he must not send him away without a few words of comfort at least. "Say to him," is the instruction of the Rabbis in such a

case, "'My heart melts for thee, for I have nothing to give thee.'"[40]

The generous must take pains to spare, as much as possible, the feelings of the beneficiary of his generosity. "It is written," the Rabbis remark, "'Happy is he who *considereth* the poor',[41] and not 'Happy is he who *giveth* to the poor'".[42] Indeed, great stress is laid on the manner in which we do our charity. We are told that R. Yannai saw a person giving a "*zuz*" (rather a big coin) to a poor man, in public. Whereupon the Rabbi plainly told that philanthropist: "It would be better that you do not give anything at all, rather than give in such a way as to put the poor man to shame."[43]

If one is in need and will not accept any charity, money should be given to him in form of a loan, with no intention of collection.[44] It is left to the wisdom and discretion of the benefactor to overcome the difficulty of avoiding the embarrassment arising from lending money to a person before he asks for it. In this connection it will be of interest to quote an example recorded by the Rabbis. A wealthy man who was reduced to poverty and who refused to take charity, was induced to accept financial aid in the following way: R. Yannai said to that person in course of conversation: "My son, I hear that you suddenly came to a great fortune by the death of a relative of yours in a far-off land. Take this money, now, and you will pay me later".[45] The poor man, being thus encouraged to expect a better future, had no more scruples in accepting, as a loan, the much-needed money.

The manner of doing charity which gained the

highest praise from the Rabbis was that of giving secretly, that is, either giving in the darkness of the night, so that the receiver could not see his benefactor, or giving through an agency.[46] The Temple in Jerusalem contained a *lishkat hashaim*, a room where "the righteous left money for charity and from which the respectable poor got their support".[47]

The '*ani ben tobim*', or the man of wealth and social standing who was reduced to poverty, was especially taken care of, and provided with the very articles he used to enjoy in his better days. The object was not to let him feel the pinch of poverty, apart from the consideration that a change to a lower standard of life might impair his health, or even cause his death.[48] We all know the famous story about Hillel the Elder, who provided for such a poor man not only the best of food and drink, but also a horse to ride on and a footman to accompany him on journeys. One day, the story goes on, Hillel, not being able to procure a footman, undertook to perform the service himself...[49] We need not quote here any more examples. We have sufficiently shown the Jewish conception concerning the treatment of the poor.

God and Men with Relation to the Poor

Whether they are "children" or "slaves", the right of possession of men by God is established. But rights carry with them duties, or a sort of responsibility to maintain them. Hence, we have the conception that "The Holy One, blessed be He, opens His treasuries and gives to people of His silver and gold."[50]

The poor, receiving nothing from His treasuries, have a perfect right to complain against Him for neglecting His duty, so to speak. It is His duty, "....Who giveth food to all flesh, to support them."[51] By supporting the poor, we place ourselves in the position of winning in a friendly competition between ourselves and the Creator. The Rabbis express it in the following words: "Since this man came and snatched (from God) the Mizvah (of giving bread to the poor), said the Holy One, blessed be He: 'I am under obligation to give him his reward'."[52]

Indeed, by taking care of the poor, we are God's bankers, for "he that is gracious unto the poor lendeth to the Lord."[53] "If this were not written in the Bible," say the Rabbis, "it would be impossible to express it. For, in connection with the statement that 'The borrower is a servant to the lender',[54] it appears as if He becomes a servant to the lender."[55]

The idea of God's indebtedness to the poor and His obligation to the rich for coming to their relief is even more emphasized in the following passages: "R. Judah ben Simon says: The poor man sits and complains (to God): 'Why am I different from the other person? He sleeps in his bed and I sleep here (in the street)'. 'Since thou hast given him (what he was lacking), I regard it,' says the Lord, 'unto thee as though thou hadst made peace between Me and him'."[56] The same idea is found in the Kabbalistic literature. A poor man, a great scholar, in the city of Safed, broke his pitcher with which he used to fetch water. Not being able to buy a new one, he complained against God, saying that he had not deserved to be as poor

as all that. As nobody came forth to restore his loss, God was about to smite the city with locusts. Fortunately, R. Isaac Luria, the great Kabbalist of that city, heard a *Bat Kol* telling him of the impending calamity and the cause thereof. He at once collected an adequate sum of money and presented it to the poor man, thus saving the city from the invasion of the locusts.[57]

Pagan Conception of Charity

A discussion between R. Akiba and Tyrannus Rufus, recorded in the Babylonian Talmud, gives us a glimpse of the pagan conception of charity. R. Akiba was asked by the Roman official: "If your God loves the poor, why does He not maintain them?" (implying by this question that we should not care for them at all). R. Akiba answered: "It is for the purpose of saving us from the fire of Gehenna." To this Tyrannus Rufus rejoined: "On the contrary, for this you should be punished with Gehenna. And I will give you a parable from which you will understand my reason for differing with you. A king became angry with his slave, and put him in prison with orders that nobody should give him food or drink. In spite of that, someone fed him and gave him drink. Would the king not be angry and punish such a man? And you, Israelites, are called servants, as it is written: 'For unto Me the children of Israel are servants'."[58] R. Akiba answered: "I will give you another parable to which the case is to be compared. A king became angry with his son, put him in prison,

and commanded that no food or drink be given to him. In spite of this order some person fed him and gave him drink. When the king became aware of it, would he not be grateful to this person, and send him a present? And we, Israelites, are called children, as it is written:[59] 'Ye are the children of the Lord your God'."[60]

We learn from this passage the attitude of paganism towards poverty and charity. The poor were regarded as slaves who have angered the gods. They are under the curse of the gods, serving thus a term in prison. Kindness shown to the poor means accordingly an interference with the will of the gods—indeed a great sin.

Relief of other kinds of suffering would fall under the same heading, for logically they show as much the displeasure of the gods. Of course, the pagans were not consistent in this respect; as somebody remarked, men are often better than their religious principles. And we know that the Romans made large distributions of grain among the needy populace as a relief of the poor.[61] But this was a function of the government, to occupy the unemployed. It was the result of the cry: *Panem et Circenses*, bread and sports. As was pointed out by others, the motives were of a purely political nature.[62] They also had a sort of lazarets, but only for the soldiers and slaves, the most troublesome elements of the population. Little, however, was done for the orphan and widow. And above all, it was pointed out that it was not real charity. Religion had little to do with it. Religion would have led, as we saw in

the case of Rufus, to the very opposite results. Pagan endeavors in this respect never reached the sublimity of "Zedakah" and "Hesed", righteousness and lovingkindness, the enthusiasm and zeal, the delicacy and refinement of "Kedushah", which only religion can give.

Jewish Attitude Towards Suffering and Poverty

R. Akiba, then, corrected the pagan by telling him that the poor were not God's slaves but his children. As children, any attention shown to them can only be pleasing to the father. But when R. Akiba answered by comparing the case to the king being angry with his son, he spoke, to a certain extent, in the sense of Tyrannus Rufus, who considered poverty as a sign of anger and wrath. He spoke, so to say, *leshitato*, from his point of view. For Judaism itself takes a much higher plane with regard to suffering, including poverty. Suffering, far from any stigma or disgrace being attached to it, may be a special expression of God's love and favor to the person that suffers.

We shall not dwell too long on this aspect, for it rather belongs to the domain of theology. It will be sufficient to mention here: "Whom God loveth he reproveth",[63] or the phrase, "sufferings of love",[64] etc. The statement of the Rabbis, that "there is no suffering without sin",[65] is by no means the general view on suffering itself. It was simply meant to pacify the mind of the afflicted person, so that he

should not become despondent and that he should bear his troubles more courageously. The statement: "If one sees that disasters have befallen him, he should investigate his conduct",[66] was also meant in the same sense. R. Akiba himself was particularly the one who raised suffering to a virtue.[67]

With respect to poverty in particular, not only is it not regarded as a vice or a crime, but is rather looked upon as a virtue; and the poor man is not deserving blame or punishment, but is entitled to special consideration and tender treatment. The term *'ani* (עני, means the one who is afflicted, humbled, bowed down, ill-treated, or miserable. It originally had a religious meaning and is connected with *'anaw* (ענו), denoting the one who is meek, submissive to God, by disposition and character, a quality which the *'ani* acquires by suffering and humiliation.[68] Indeed, we notice that the terms *'anawim* and *'aniyyim* the meek and the poor, are almost synonymous.[69] In many places in the Bible, it is not certain whether the reading should be *'aniyyim*, the poor, or *'anawim*, the meek. In some places the Kere is *'aniyyim* and the Ketib is *'anawim*; and in some places it is just the other way. Thus we have: "He deviseth.... to destroy the *poor*"[70] or "O ye that would.... destroy the *poor*"[71] according to the Kere. The Ketib, however, has in both places "the meek", though, in the last verse, it was meant to be parallel to "the needy." In the Psalms we read: "He hath not forgotten the cry of the humble," and "Forget not the "*humble*",[72] while the Ketib has, in both verses, "the *poor*".

Again, when we read: "The poor and the needy seek water, and there is none, and their tongue faileth for thirst; I, the Lord will answer them, I, the God of Israel will not forsake them,"[73] we feel that it is almost an endearing name, for it implies at once helplessness, meekness, and humbleness. Similar expressions, testifying to the sympathy and tenderness shown to the poor, are found in the Psalms. "But I am poor and needy; O God, make haste unto me that am poor and needy, the Lord will account it unto me."[75] The Rabbis inferred from these Psalms that the prayer of the poor man is on the same level with that of Moses.[76] We also notice that the Psalmist uses the term "the poor" in the sense of "the righteous", in opposition to the wicked. Describing the actions and thoughts of the wicked: "He hath said in his heart, God hath forgotten...."; he says: "Unto Thee the poor man committeth himself."[77] There are a good many more passages in the Bible showing the high regard Judaism had for the poor, but the examples quoted are sufficient for our purpose.

The Poor Held in High Esteem

The high esteem in which the poor were held is even more emphasized in Rabbinic literature. Their close relation to God is described in different ways.

We are told that the poor are God's people. This idea is expressed by the Rabbis in the following words: "It is written: 'If thou lend money to any of my people.'[79] Said Israel to the Holy One, blessed be He: 'Who are Thy people?' To this God answered

that they were the poor, for it is stated: '...The Lord hath comforted His people, and hath compassion upon His afflicted'[80]: It is customary with some rich men not to make themselves known to their poor relatives. 'All the brethren of the poor do hate him'.[81] But with the Holy One, blessed be He, it is not so. Though 'both riches and honor come of Him',[82] yet He sheltered only the poor, for 'The Lord hath founded Zion', and therein shall the poor of His people find protection.'"[83]

The poor are God's people in the sense that they are with Him, or that He associates with them. In the language of the Rabbis: "'The poor man is not with thee, but with Me', saith the Lord; the ways of the Holy One, blessed be He, are not like those of mortals. It often happens that a rich man, seeing his poor relative approaching, hides himself, for he is ashamed to converse with him because of his poverty. But this is not the way of the Holy One, blessed be He. Who are His people? The poor. When He sees a poor man He attaches Himself, so to speak, to him."[84]

According to Rabban Gamaliel, the reason for stating in the Torah: "Thou shalt surely give him, and thy heart shall not be grieved when thou givest unto him", is because God Himself is surety for the poor man.[85] Moreover, He Himself accompanies the poor on their wanderings for alms. We are told that when the poor man stands at the door with an outstretched hand, the Holy One, blessed be He, is at his right side.[86]

We also have the idea that the poor are God's

own, constituting His household, so to speak. "The Holy One said to Israel: 'Thou hast four classes of people in thy household, thy sons, thy daughters, thy servants, and thy maid-servants. Even so have I four classes: the Levites, the strangers, the orphans, and the widows'."[87] The same idea is repeated in another place, adding the following reasons for the assertion that these four are regarded as God's own. "In connection with the stranger it is said: 'He loveth the stranger';[88] with regard to the orphan and widow, we find that He is 'A father of the fatherless and a judge of the widow';[89] and to the Levites He said: 'I am thy portion and thy inheritance.'"[90]

The above idea was expressed in connection with the Biblical commandment: "And thou shalt rejoice before the Lord thy God, thy son, and thy daughter, and thy man-servant, and thy maid-servant and the Levite that is within thy gates, and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow that are in the midst of thee".[91] In this commandment, we particularly note the nature of the rejoicing or שמחה. There is nothing gloomy or depressing about it for the poor. The feature of alms is entirely absent in the relation between the rich and the poor on that occasion. They are all invited together with the rest of the nation to the שלחן גבוה, to rejoice before God. They, the Levite, the stranger, the orphan, and the widow, constituting, so to speak, the household of God, are the hosts entertaining the others, who were merely "thou and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy man-servant, and thy maid-servant."

Indeed, the giving of charity, or the feeding of

the poor, is considered as making a gift to God,[92] or as an invitation to God to partake of one's substance. For God feels the responsibility of causing one to be poor. Hence it is said: "Whoever mocks the poor is regarded as if he mocks Me."[93] And similarly: "When you are feeding the poor, I consider it as if you were feeding Me."[94]

We have sufficiently shown the attitude of Judaism towards poverty and the poor. Poverty was generally regarded as a meritorious quality, and the poor were looked upon as men of honesty and integrity. It is for this reason that the prophet says: "The humble also shall increase their joy in the Lord; and the neediest among men shall exult in the Holy One of Israel."[95]

Israel and Poverty

It is in harmony with this sentiment concerning poverty that the whole nation of Israel is called, as a title of honor, "The Poor". When the Psalmist says: "But I am *poor* and suffering, let Thy salvation O God, set me up on high"; and "The *meek* will see this and be rejoiced"; and "The Lord listeneth unto the needy", we feel that he had in mind Israel as a whole, rather than the individual. For he winds up his Psalm with the words: "God will save Zion, and will build the cities of Judah".[96] In connection with this Psalm the Rabbis remarked: "Wherever it is written '*dal*' (דל), '*ani*' (עני), '*ebyon*' (אביון) it refers to Israel".[97]

But the Rabbis do not stop with the mere name. It is even assumed that an experience of actual po-

verty (עניות) is necessary for Israel's spiritual welfare. You know the famous passage of the Talmud: "It is written: 'Behold, I have refined thee, but not with silver, I have tried thee in the furnace of affliction'[98]— to show that the Holy One, blessed be He, investigated all virtues, and could not find one to fit Israel better than that of poverty."[99] The same statement is found in another place, with the following addition. "For because of poverty they fear God....There are no doers of kindness but because of poverty, there are no givers of charity but because of poverty, there are no people who obey the Law but because of poverty, etc."[100]

Nay, it would even seem that poverty imparts to Israel a certain beauty of character of which it otherwise would be utterly deprived. "It is a common saying: 'Poverty betfis Israel as a leather bridle strap becomes a white steed.'"[101] The same idea is expressed in another place: "Poverty is as becoming to the daughter of Jacob as a red ribbon to a white mare." And: "Israel needs the carob (a vegetable used as a food by the poor) in order to stir him up for repentance."[102]

It is evident from the above statement that the function of poverty, as applied to the nation as a whole, was to mitigate, or curb that element of rashness in Israel's life character, for which it was known, and which usually goes hand in hand with wealth. "R. Simon ben Lakish said: Israel is the boldest or the most arrogant of the nations."[103] But let us quote the words of Moses: "But Jeshurun waxed fat, and kicked: thou didst wax fat, thou didst grow thick,

thou didst become gross, and he forsook God who made him, and contemned the Rock of his salvation".[104]

We need not dwell in this subject any longer. The history of our people, in whatever country they lived, testifies to the truthfulness of this matter.[105]

Judaism Considers the Two Aspects of Poverty

This glorification of poverty, making it a thing desirable in itself, and declaring it almost as an indispensable condition for salvation, is only one aspect of the matter. There is, however, another aspect, giving us the very opposite picture of this state of deprivation. Judaism was not blind to this aspect. It is the greatness of the Jewish mind which found its expression in Rabbinic literature that it provided us with a system of checks and balances, viewing everything in its various aspects, which prevented Judaism from abandoning itself entirely to one-sided conceptions of great problems. Such one-sided conceptions lead only to narrowness, and have a tendency to degenerate into excesses and extravagances. We speak now a great deal of organized charity, a subject which we shall still have occasion to consider. But there is also such a thing as organized poverty, which forms the greatest danger to both religion and humanity, and to which mankind is easily exposed when accepting a one-sided view of the problems occupying us in these lectures. Think only of the anchorites, the hermits, and the various mendicant orders in the Middle Ages, and you will easily understand what I mean by organized poverty. Judaism was pre-

served from this danger by paying sufficient attention also to the other aspect of the matter.

(a) POVERTY THE GREATEST HARDSHIP

First, Judaism considered poverty as the greatest of sufferings. Among all afflictions, the Rabbis say, there is none harder to bear than poverty. It outweighs all other kinds of sufferings. And Job, the greatest of sufferers, when the choice was put to him by the Holy One, blessed be He, between poverty and all other kinds of sufferings combined, such as leprosy, loss of children, etc., etc., he chose the latter.[106] Poverty being the greatest of sufferings, can accordingly only be justified on the ground that it is a test. As the rabbis express it, both the rich man and the poor man are on trial; the rich man, whether his wealth will not spoil him and harden him against the poor; the poor man, whether his deprivation will not embitter him and make him rebellious against the affliction. But there comes always the question in the defence of the poor: Why was it that God did not try him with wealth rather than with poverty? Such thoughts and silent murmurings and protests, however inaudible, breed a kind of impotent rebellion, which may prove spiritually fatal, even more than riches.

The greatest of hardships connected with poverty was the loss of independence, which our sages valued very highly. According to the rabbis, Jonathan the son of Gershon accepted the position of "priest to the graven image," in the house of Michah,[107] because of a tradition in his family: "Let one hire himself out

to '*Abodah Zarah*, rather than be in neeed of receiving charity from people."[108] Of course, that poor Levite, the rabbis explained, made the mistake of taking the term '*Abodah Zarah* in its technical sense, *i. e.* "idolatry"; when it was really meant to be taken in its literal meaning, that is, "strange work." In this sense, it merely means that one should value his independence more than his dignity. And when the two come in conflict, the latter should give way. "Flay a carcase in the market-place, receive thy wage, and do not say: 'I am a great man, and it is below my dignity to do such a thing' "[109] was the advice given by Rav to one of his pupils.

But the preservation of one's independence was of great consideration even in matters of religion. "Let thy expenditure for the Sabbath not exceed those of any week-day, in order that thou shalt not be in need of people's help"[110] is a famous saying of the rabbis. On the other hand, honest pursuit of business or any profession or trade was raised to the highest religious virtue. To quote only a few examples, "He who enjoys the toil of his hand, is greater than he who fears God";[111] or: "The world is pleased with him who pursues business in an honest way; and such a man is regarded as if he fulfilled the entire law".[112]

To be sure, these statements are not to be taken at their face value. They certainly contain a great deal of exaggeration.[113] But at the same time they show us to what extent the rabbis exalted the independent self-supporting life, and dreaded its loss, which is usually the direct result of the necessity of receiving charity.

The degradation of the poor is pictured in various ways. "When a person has to take charity, his face changes color, in a manner similar to that of the *Kerum*"—a certain bird which was supposed to have been found near the sea, and which , in sunshine, assumed various colors.[114] Or, the poor look as if they were "punished with the judgment of fire and water".[115] "All the days of the poor are evil."[116] "In the Book of Ben Sira, it is added that there is no rest for the poor even in the night. For his roof is lower than those of others, hence in the rainy season the water from the adjoining house is pouring upon his house; and his vineyard is located on the top of the mountain, hence in the windy season, his soil is being carried down to the other vineyard in the valley."[117]

But let me only remind you of the word nisrak (נצרך) which came also into the jargon or Yiddish language, and which denoted a poor, humbled, and degraded person for whom we feel pity and compassion.

Indeed that "the poor man is regarded as dead" is a statement of the rabbis well known to you.[118] He is dead as an influence. The words: "For all the men are dead who sought thy life,"[119] were explained to mean that those men were reduced to poverty, and therefore Moses had nothing to fear them. In a word, to quote Koheleth, "The wisdom of the poor man is held in contempt, and his words are not heard."[120]

(b) POVERTY AS A DEGENERATING FORCE

Secondly, I have spoken of poverty as a spiritual force, and of the advantages it affords man in his

progress in the wordly virtues of meekness, humility, submission, obedience to the will of God, etc.. But there is also another side to the picture, which is sad enough, and is largely calculated to defeat its own end. Humanity being constituted as it is, with desires and appetites, not all of which can easily be dispensed with, poverty leads the poor to temptations which may be beyond his power to resist. You remember the supplication of Agur, when he says: "Give me neither poverty nor riches; feed me with my allotted bread. Lest I be full, and deny and say: 'Who is the Lord?' or lest I be poor, and steal, and profane the name of my God."[121] We thus see that while riches may lead to idolatry, poverty may bring to the profanation of the name of God by swearing falsely. Which of the two is the greater evil? According to the rabbis, it is the latter, that which might be caused by poverty.[122] The degenerating effects of poverty is thus expressed by the prophet: "And it shall come to pass, that when they shall be hungry, they shall fret themselves and curse by their king and by their God".[123] And, in the words of the rabbis: "The crushing exacting details of poverty cause man to transgress the will of his Maker".[124]

Again, the rabbis also realized that poverty may engender certain undesirable qualities which are the very opposite of godliness. "The guiding spirit of poverty is called *nabal*", a term which is taken to mean dirt and filth[125]. Then you know the famous passage: "The daughters of Israel are comely, but their poverty makes them repellent".[126] If this was said about the daughters, whether in the physical

or intellectual sense, it might, as well, have been applied, with the same measure of truthfulness, or untruthfulness, to the sons of Israel. And although the sons of the poor were looked upon as those from whom learning comes forth,[127] it was openly declared that the scholar of poor extraction stands on a lower level than a member of a wealthy family with an equal attainment in scholarship. While the one was denoted as *dag tahor* (clean fish), the other was given the appellation of *dag tame* (unclean fish).[128]

Judaism and Hedonism

Poverty is thus, as is clear from the preceding remarks, not the unmixed good generally taught by a certain class of moralists. It is as indicated, not an object desirable in itself. If it is praised, it is because of its being conducive to certain virtues, not always compatible with wealth and affluence. But, as we have seen, it has pitfalls of its own just as incompatible with a real spiritual life as riches and abundance. But there is also another consideration. It is the attitude of Judaism toward the good things of this world (fundamentally differing from that of certain other religions), that prevented it from indulging in certain extravagances, into which other religions degenerated in the course of history. I had occasion, in the class, to speak to you against such hasty generalizations as declared that Judaism is incompatible with asceticism. A religion which counts among heroes those distinguished for their abandoning all the joys of life, or what we consider as such, and

which, in its authoritative literature, has such passages as that which we read in the sixth chapter of Pirke Abot: "This is the way that is becoming for the study of the Torah: a morsel of bread with salt thou must eat, and water by measure thou must drink, thou must sleep upon the ground, and live a life of trouble the while thou toilest in the Torah. If thou doest thus, 'Happy shalt thou be and it shall be well with thee' (Psalm 128.2); happy shalt thou be in this world, and it shall be well with thee in the world to come"[129]—such a religion can certainly not be declared as hedonistic and strictly hostile to all asceticism. And I must say, in passing, that this passage can be multiplied by many other passages with the same tendency, whilst our edifying literature offers us any number of stories and legends, illustrating ascetic currents in Judaism. But this much may be said with certainty that, though it may be regarded sometimes as an aid to religion, asceticism was by no means made a condition for salvation. It was subject to a healthy control and generally balanced by other tendencies. Rabbi Judah ha-Levi, with the instinct of a poet, hit the right strain when he said in his famous dialogue, *Kusari*: (Book II, 48). "Know that our Torah is constituted of the three psychological states: 'Fear, Love, and Joy' (that is to say, all the principal emotions of men are enlisted in the service of God). By each of these thou mayest be brought into communion with thy God. Thy contriteness in the days of fasting does not bring thee nearer to God than thy joy on the Sabbath days and on festivals, provided

thy joy emanates from a devotional and perfect heart. And just as prayer requires devotion and thought, so does joy, namely, that thou wilt rejoice in His commandments for their own sake (the only reasons for this rejoicing being) the love of Him who commanded it, and the desire of recognizing God's goodness towards thee. Consider these feasts as if thou wert the guest of God invited to His table and His bounty, and thank Him for it inwardly and outwardly. And if thy joy in God excites thee even to the degree of singing and dancing, it is a service to God, keeping thee attached to Him. But the Torah did not leave these things to our arbitrary will, but put them all under control. For man lacks the power to make use of the functions of body and soul in their proper proportions".

Thus far Rabbi Judah ha-Levi. But when body and soul are alike the subjects of religious concern and the functions of both are viewed as having their equal share in building up the kingdom of God, an exclusive exaltation of the soul at the expense of the body would only be destructive to the scheme of salvation as laid down by the Torah. To mortify the flesh by dire poverty, such as other religions inflicted on their adherents, would be an anomaly in Judaism. This was a joyless life, always with an eye on death when the struggle with the flesh would cease. For the whole-hearted *simhah*, or rejoicing, as commanded by the Bible, with its peculiar characteristic of reconciling the body with the soul and bringing harmony between the various functions of

man by placing them all under the control of the Law, has no room in the monkish life.

Notice only such verses as these. "Seven days shalt thou keep a feast unto the Lord thy God in the place which the Lord shall choose; because the Lord thy God shall bless thee in all thine increase, and in all the work of thy hands, and thou shalt be altogether joyful."[130] Also: "...And ye shall rejoice in all that ye put your hands into, ye and your households, wherein the Lord thy God hath blessed thee."[131] And similarly we have: "But thou shalt eat them before the Lord thy God in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy man-servant, and thy maid-servant, and the Levite....and thou shalt rejoice before the Lord thy God in all that thou puttest thy hand into."[132] Note that, in all these verses, the products of one's field and the acquisitions of one's hand are just as well a cause of the rejoicing. The men invited here to the table of the Lord, to partake of His bounty and to rejoice before Him, are not exactly the priests or even the students of the Torah. As may be clearly seen from the context, they belong to prosperous communities made up largely of farmers possessing land and in a condition to employ farm-hands or half-slaves on their estate.[133] Occasionally some among them can even speak of savings, which enable them to be helpful to their neighbors.[134]

It is such a rural industrious population, living by the labor of their hands, kindly disposed towards their surroundings and generous to those depending upon them, visiting the chosen place on their festi-

vals, as remote from extravagance and luxury, and from abject poverty — it is that class of people which formed the ideal of the Torah, and to which the invitation to rejoice before the Lord is extended. They are all men of families; bidden, as they are, to rejoice before the Lord with their wives, sons, and daughters, they are also made responsible for those less fortunate among them, all of whom they have more or less to maintain.

Judaism and Asceticism

It is true that not all the great men in Israel understood this ideal alike. Not to mention here such communities as, these which according to some historians, formed the majority of the Essene settlements. For the Essenes abandoned themselves mostly to a contemplative life, and formed a sort of Judaism within Judaism, or, in other words, they represented merely a sect. Nor is it necessary to speak here of later Jewish philosophers who also considered a life of solitude and continuous contemplation as the highest attainment of perfection. For these followed influences rather Greek than Jewish.

But we have, even in rabbinic literature, passages just contradicting the view of an ideal community as pointed out above. The following is found in the Sifre: "It is written: 'This book of the Law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night.'[135] In order that one should not take this literally, and thus neglect his means of livelihood, it is stated in the Torah: 'And thou

mayest gather in thy corn, thy wine, and thine oil."[136] This explanation of the two apparently contradictory verses, was given by Rabbi Ishmael, and is in accordance with the conception pointed out above. But R. Simon ben Yohai objected to it, saying that one could always find work about his field and thus neglect the study of the Torah. His opinion was that one need not worry about his work in the fields at all, for, he said: "When Israel acts according to the wish of God, its work is being done by others."[137]

This rather ascetic view of R. Simon is in accordance with what we know of his life and what legend tell about him. Because of Roman persecution, he and his son hid for many years in a cave where they spent their time in study and contemplation. When they left their hiding-place and saw people tilling the soil they remarked: "These men neglect eternal life, and busy themselves with momentary needs."[138] The legend goes on to tell us: "Whatever they looked at was immediately destroyed by fire. Thereupon a *Bat Kol* said unto them: 'You came out to destroy My world; return to your cave!' "[138]

The words of *Bat Kol* clearly showed the attitude of Judaism towards ascetic views like those of R. Simon ben Yohai. His opinion, in opposition to that of R. Ishmael, quoted above, was openly objected to by the Amoraim, "Said Abayye: Many acted according to R. Ishmael, and they were successful; while those who followed R. Simon failed."[139] And we also know that Rabba ordered his pupils to stay home during certain seasons of the year, for the pur-

pose of enabling them to attend to their agricultural duties.[140]

But we notice that R. Simon ben Yohai himself well realized the difficulty of putting his theories into practical life. He said by way of regret: "How could one spend his time in the study of the Torah, not knowing whence his support would come? This was only possible to those who lived on the *manna*, or to the priests who were supported by the *terumah*."[141] In view of this, it is not at all surprizing that, with all his tendency toward asceticism, R. Simon was fully alive to the importance of work, which he esteemed very highly. It was said in his name: "Great is the importance of honest work. For the generation of the flood was destroyed only because of its ignominious dealings."[142]

In this connection it will be of interest to note of R. Eleazar of Modi'in, who, on one occasion, said: "He who is provided for the day and worries about the morrow lacks faith" [143]—a statement well showing his inclination towards asceticism—that the same R. Eleazar praised very highly the person who is engaged in business, saying: "One who is honestly engaged in trade is regarded as if he observed the whole Torah."[144]

Position of Work in Judaism

This brings us to the position of labor in Judaism, which proved another safeguard against the danger of praising poverty too much, thereby raising it to a regular cult and organizing under its auspices a whole

chain of pauper communities, or mendicant orders. I do not wish to enter here upon the question of the dignity of work which distinguished Judaism so much from almost all the nations of antiquity. Much has been written about it. We all know that nearly the majority of the rabbis, in the tannaitic period, practised the humble professions of tailor, shoemaker blacksmith, etc. But I must say a few words upon its theological aspect and spiritual possibilities.

We have already mentioned, in another place, the statement: "He who enjoys the toil of his hand is greater than he who fears God."[145] This sounds rather a bit exaggerated. But let us examine the following: "An excellent thing is the study of the Torah combined with some wordly occupation, for the labor demanded by both of them makes sin to be forgotten. All study of the Law without work must in the end be futile and become the cause of sin".[146] In this passage the value of labor is emphasized through its negative side, being important only as a means to divert the mind from sin. We have however, other statements, wherein manual labor is required as an end in itself, and is exalted to the highest religious virtue.

In the first place, the rabbis tell us that the obligation of doing work constitutes a divine commandment of the Torah. "Israel was charged to do work on the six days, just as they were ordered to rest on the seventh day. For it is written: 'Six days *shalt* thou labor and do thy work, and on the seventh day *shalt* thou rest'".[147] To labor as a commandment of the Torah means, then, to worship

God in this particular day. For this reason according to the rabbis, it was called *'Abodah* (עבודה) namely *'abodat ha-Shem* (עבודת ה') which means the worship of God.[148]

Labor was, moreover, raised to a religious institution. For we are told that the bestowal of work upon Israel, as well as the giving of the Torah, was accompanied by a covenant between God and Israel.[149] It has further a propitiatory, or protective effect.[150] It causes sin to be forgiven, and saves one from trouble. And we are also told that he who is engaged in work causes the *Shekinah* to dwell upon Israel.[151] For work is a divine quality which men should try to acquire. It is the creative attribute, the primeval realization of His holy will, calling all beings into existence. Man imitating this quality, inasmuch as he is producing for the sake of *kiyyum ha-'olam* (קיום העולם) the perpetuation of the world, shares in a divine work.[152]

The following passage, however, shows an exception to the general idea, prevalent in rabbinic literature, of the high esteem in which labor was held. "As soon as one was appointed chief or head of the community, he is no more allowed to engage in manual labor in the presence of three persons."[153] But there can be no doubt that this prohibition applied only to the chief magistrate, who was usually one in the community.[154] And this was with no other purpose than that of impressing the people with his importance. One commentator justly remarked, in connection with this rule against work, that a similar custom existed in Britain where the magistrates kept

aloof socially from the attorney and other practitioners of the court, in order that the latter should respect them more. Then, again, it was only while holding office, and during that time only in the presence of the people, that these dignitaries were to refrain from doing any labor. But before their appointment, or even after promotion, in private, they no doubt engaged in the husbanding of their farms.

The ban on work in such cases is of little significance, indeed, as regards the effect on the Jewish attitude towards labor as a whole. The disdain for manual labor among the Jews, which we find described by Smolensky and others,[155] was the result of the decline and decay which set in Jewish life during the Middle Ages. The price which our rabbis and leaders paid for their unfavorable attitude towards labor was indeed very high. For it was that attitude which caused the rise of the proletariat, in Germany and Russia, who rebelled against the influence of the real Jewish leaders, and thus took their revenge.

But let us return to the olden times, when labor was a religious institution, in which the nation took a pride and which endowed it with such spiritual possibilities as to make laziness, even holy laziness, impossible and incompatible with a really religious life. This excluded every thought of bringing poverty into a regular religious system and of endowing mendicancy with a certain celestial halo as the best means of salvation. With the Jew, the blessing of God and salvation lay in the opposite direction, in activity and work. And it is very interesting to see how the

rabbis perceived an admonition for work and labor from which no man can emancipate himself, in the words: "And the Lord thy God will bless thee in all that thou doest", which is the concluding verse of a group of laws dealing mostly with the giving of charity to the poor, gifts to the freed slaves, etc.[156]

Prohibition of Celibacy

But the most important safeguard Judaism had against the danger of an exaggerated idealization of poverty and deprivation, and which preserved it at the same time from the excesses of asceticism so rampant in other religions, was the prohibition of celibacy. This prohibition, or, to speak in a positive way, the institution of marriage, or the divine commandment of the propagation of the race, gave both Jewish thought and Jewish institutions a complexion of their own. It called into being new standards of duty, and created the *adam miyyisrael* which is a type of its own. Judaism has scholars, or *talmide hakamim*, it has pious men and pious women, it has saints and martyrs, but there is no room in it for the religious community, or religious order, as contrasted with the rest of the people among whom the former dwell.

No doubt the religious orders proved the leaven of the community in their religious influence. But the effect of celibacy was that the community became divided into two elements, the leaven and the dough, which is a most unhealthy state of things. In Judaism, however, through the law of marriage, the leaven and the dough comingled so thoroughly that every

particle of the community consisted of dough and leaven, which is the only normal condition of things.

All this was the consequence of the law of פריה ורביה. Whatever his aspirations to a superior holiness, the Jew always remained the father or member of a family with all the duties and responsibilities incidental thereto.

Now a few words with regard to this law, and its particular influence on the problem of philanthropy.

In Pirke Abot we read that one ought to marry at the age of eighteen.[157] Only those who wished to devote themselves to the study of the Torah were allowed to remain single after that age.[158] In another place it is stated that one should not live a life of celibacy, unless he had already begot children.[159] There is a difference of opinion between the school of Shammai and that of Hillel as to the number of the children and their sex. While according to the former he must have had at least two male children, the latter maintained that one male and one female child are sufficient. But all agree as to the individual obligation to propagate the species.

As a final decision in this matter, the following statement of R. Nahman, in the name of Samuel, was accepted. "A man is forbidden to remain single even if he has children from a previous marriage."[160] Of the tannaitic period we know only of one man, Ben 'Azzai, who refused to marry, saying, as an excuse for his celibacy: "What shall I do? My soul desireth the Torah."[161] But even he married, in his younger years, the daughter of R. Akiba, whom he divorced at a latter period.[162] In the Middle Ages

there were R. Judah Brieli and R. Moses Hayyim Luzzatto, both of Italy, who never married—a fact which provoked against them the displeasure of the sages of that time. I have not found any one, even among those who contested rabbinic authority, with the exception of the author of the famous work *Behinat ha-Kabbalah*,[163] who disputed or tried to weaken the law of propagation.

It all goes to show that the nation as a whole has accepted marriage as an obligation of the individual, though a few exceptions may be pointed out who acted to the contrary. This fact not only counteracted all tendencies towards asceticism, but influenced the whole attitude toward the question of charity—its extent and its limitations. It created a new centre of duties, attachments, and tender sympathies, encouraged and fostered by religion, and not less by nature.

The Family and Charity

This centre was the family. The words of the Psalmist: "Happy are they that do justice, and do righteousness at all times",[164] were interpreted to refer to those who support their children of minor age.[165] This interpretation forms the basis for a law to the same effect. There is a difference of opinion as to the age they cease to be minors, when the father's responsibility ends. This point will be discussed later;[166] at present it is sufficient to show that the father's obligation to support his children comes under the heading of charity.

This centre which begins with the family is gradually extended, according to the means of the benefactor, till it includes all the poor people of the world. To illustrate this principle, let us quote the following: "He who has much provision in his house, and wants to support others....his father and mother come first, then, of what is left over, he should support his brothers and sisters; next come the people of his house, *i. e.*, his slaves; of what is still left over, he should support other relatives, and next come the poor of his neighborhood, and then the poor of all Israel."[167]

NOTES

JEWISH SAINTS IN MEDIAEVAL GERMANY

[This essay was read before Temple Beth El, New York, about 1903.]

"AS OTHERS SAW HIM"

[This essay first appeared in the Jewish Chronicle of London, May 10-17, 1895, as an anonymous review of an anonymous volume under the above title (London, Heinemann, 1895) which in later editions appeared under the name of the author Joseph Jacobs.]

[1] [See D. Chwolson, *Das letzte Passamahl Christi*, Petersburg, 1892, pp. 53-4.]

[2] The whole story of the Hanan bazaars is probably based on a wrong reading—Beth Hanan instead of Beth Hini or Bethania; see *Monatsschrift*, 1877, p. 532; Kohut, *'Aruk* III, p. 450.

[3] By the way, the reference in Holtzman's *Handkommentar*, *Mark.* 22,37—*Bereshith Raba* is wrong and ought to be *Rabbati* as in Raymundus Martini, *Pugio fidei*, p. 476.

ABRAHAM GEIGER

[This essay was written as a review of *Abraham Geiger*, *Leben und Lebenswerk*, Berlin, 1910, but was not published.—All references of page numbers without title are to this volume.]

[1] [Ludwig Geiger died in 1920.]

[2] *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*, 1896.

[3] London, 1898, p. 37.

LEOPOLD ZUNZ

[This essay was written in 1889 for a prize offered by the New York Jewish Ministers' Association, which was awarded for it in 1890. The intention to enlarge it (see p. 140) and to add some of Zunz's unpublished notes (see p. 137) was never carried out. In 1894 Maybaum, *Aus dem Leben von Leopold Zunz*, p. 2, note 2, mentions this essay as soon to appear.]

[1] See, *e. g.*, Zunz's admirable preface to Krochmal's מורה נבוכי הזמן, which Zunz edited (Lemberg, 1851), also his biography of R. Azariah de Rossi in the periodical כרם חמד vol. V, 131, *seq.*

In the periodical *Jedidja* (ed. by Heinemann) of 1818 Zunz gives a Hebrew translation of the poem *Die Sommernacht* by Klopstock.

[2] For sources about the early youth of Zunz see Jost's article *Vor einem halben Jahrhundert* in Pascheles, *Sippurim*, III, p. 141, *seq.* See also Zunz's pamphlet *Samuel Meyer Ehrenberg, Inspector der Samsonischen Freischule zu Wolfenbüttel* (Brunswick, 1854) according to which Jost's unfavorable account of this institution before 1807 may be a little modified. Other accounts are to be found in *Sulamith*, II, 131 *seq.* and in *Orient*, 1844, Nos. 5–8. [For sources of Zunz's biography see now Geiger, *Aus Leopold Zunz, Nachlass, Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland*, V. 1892, pp. 233–68; S. Maybaum, *Aus dem Leben von Leopold Zunz*, Berlin, 1894, and S. P. Rabinowitz's Hebrew biography, Warsaw, 1896.]

The name Zunz occurring very seldom, we may perhaps draw attention here to R. Aryeh Leb Zunz (died 1833) of Russia, known in the rabbinical literature by many works. See שם הגדולים החדש I. 42, No. 23. See also מפלת עיר הצדק. We owe this information to the kindness of our estimable friend Dr. S. Neumann, the president of the Curatorium of the Zunz-Stiftung in Berlin. [See also M. Brann and D. Kaufmann, *Leopold Zunz und seine Familie*, Breslau, 1895 (reprint from *Monatsschrift*, 1894) pp. 3–15; Kaufmann, *Die Familie Zunz*, including 52 tumular inscriptions from Frankfurt, 19–26; Brann, *Leopold Zunz und seine Frankfurter Ahnen* with family-tree, 29–32; Kaufmann, *R. Loeb Zunz*.]

[3] [See Steinschneider's introduction to the second edition of the *G. V.* p. XV.]

[4] See the chapter "*Jung Palaestina*" in Strodtmann's *Heine's Leben und seine Werke*. The passage quoted is only to be found in the first edition (Berlin, 1867).

[5] See the remarks of Gans quoted by Strodtmann in the above mentioned book, p. 300 (second edition). Immanuel Wolf's essay *Ueber den Begriff einer Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, in Zunz's *Zeitschrift* (pp. 1-25) is nothing else but a rather lengthy paraphrase of Gans' remarks. Comp. also Zunz, *Zur Geschichte*, pp. 1-2.

[6] Heine's *Gesammelte Werke* (ed. Karpeles), VIII, Berlin, 1887, p. 385.

[7] See Zunz's *Zeitschrift*, p. 539.

[8] Heine's *Gesammelte Werke*, VIII, 359.

[9] Zunz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, II, 183-190. Comp. also his *Vorrede* to his *Predigten*, Berlin, 1846.

[10] Besides the authorities quoted in the last six notes see also Graetz, *Geschichte*, XI, 408–598, and compare also Geiger's *Nachgelassene Schriften*, I, 301. S. Stern and Ritter in their histories of the Jewish reformation give a more favorable account of this time; they perhaps do more than justice to the noble efforts of such men as Friedlaender, Jacobsohn, and a few others. But in general as far as they concern the unhappy state of Jewish literature and the mismanagement of the communities in that period, Zunz's statements are true, and we have followed them in the text. Comp. also the interesting correspondence between M. A. Stern and G. Riesser in the *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland*, II, 47, *seq.*

[11] See the article *Massora Talmud Kabbala Grammatik in historischer Wirksamkeit*, which was reprinted in the *Gesammelte Schriften*, III, 80, *seq.*

[12] *Gesammelte Schriften*, I, 1-31. See especially note 2 on p. 12.

[13] See Zunz's *Zeitschrift*, 277-384, where this essay on Rashi was published. A few corrections to this essay are given by Zunz himself in the preface to the *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, p. XI-XII. S. Bloch in his Hebrew translation of this biography also corrects Zunz in some places. The last and best biography of Rashi is by I. H. Weiss, תולדות רש"י, Wien, 1882. [M. Liber, Rashi, Philadelphia, 1906; E. M. Lipschütz, ר' שלמה יצחקי, Warsaw, 1912.] About the historical importance of this essay see Zunz's *Zur Geschichte*, 158; Philippson's *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, 1886, 246.

[14] See Heine's *Gesammelte Werke* (ed. Karpeles), IX, p. 50.

[15] Geiger's *Nachgelassene Schriften*, V, 81; comp. I, 307.

[16] Quoted by Steinschneider in the first edition of his pamphlet, *Die Schriften des Dr. Zunz* (Berlin, 1857), p. 6.

[17] See Bloch in the *Graetz-Jubelschrift*, p. 214, note. [Now

in the Library of the *Alliance Israélite Universelle*, Paris, MS. 106, see *REJ*, XL, p. 36.]

[18] See אגרות שד"ל, p. 602; comp. *Magazin*, 1880, p. 59; a refutation of Samiler by Rapoport is to be found in כרם חמד VI, 96, *seq.*

[19] See Rapoport's sharp review of this work in כרם חמד VI, 204, *seq.* It is only just to mention that in a later work Chajes confessed his injustice against Zunz and deeply regretted it.

[20] See *e. g.* Krochmal, מורה נבוכי הזמן, chap. XIII. Geiger's *Urschrift*, 302, *seq.*, and *Nachgelassene Schriften*, I, 12, *seq.*, and almost the whole of Weiss' first two volumes of his *Geschichte der Jüdischen Tradition*, deal with this subject. Comp. Z. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, p. XII.

[21] We are thinking of such works as Frankel's and Freudenthal's on the influence of the Haggadah on the Alexandrian schools; see Graetz, Rahmer, and others on the relation between the Midrash and the patristic literature; Kohut on the relation between the Babylonian Talmud and Parsism; Geiger and others on the influence of Judaism on Mohammedanism.

[22] See *Vorrede zu Das Lied der Lieder von Rebenstein* (1834, republished in the *Gesammelte Schriften*, I, 142); Salfeld, *Das Hohelied bei den jüdischen Erklärern des Mittelalters* (*Magazin*, 1878, 110, *seq.* and 1879, 20, *seq.*). Again, *Namen der Juden* (Berlin 1839, *Gesammelte Schriften* II, 1), the *Additamenta ad Delitzschii Catalogum*, Grimma, 1838 (especially Nrs. III–XI–XXVII) about Tosafists; the essays relating to the geographical literature of the Jews published first in English and republished in the German original in the *Gesammelte Schriften*, I, 146; II, 265.

[23] See the introduction to the *Literaturgeschichte der Synagogalen Poesie*, pp. V, VI.

[24] In this index by Gestetner, Berlin, 1889, are also included the *Nachträge zur Literaturgeschichte* by Zunz (Berlin, 1867). See also *Gesammelte Schriften*, I, 123, and *ha-Mazkir* XI, 68, and XII, 58.

[25] See Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 284, No. 1, to which among others Landshut's עמודי העבודה and Luzzatto's לוח הפייטנים may be added.

[26] See P. F. Frankl, *Fragmente einer Kalir'schen Keroba*

(*Zunz-Jubelschrift*, p. 160), also Ziemlich on the Nurenberg Mahzor, *Magazin*, 1884, 113; 1885, 45 *seq.*; comp. also Kaufmann's pamphlet *Paul de Lagardes Jüdische Gelehrsamkeit.* [Freimann, *Zum Machsor Ritus von Aleppo, Zeitschrift für Hebräische Bibliographie*, XVI, 1913, pp. 59–65; Davidson, *Mahzor Yannai*, 1919 and his forthcoming *Thesaurus of Medieval Hebrew Poetry.*]

[27] See *e. g. Gesammelte Schriften*, III, 31, 50, and elsewhere.

[28] See Geiger's, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, V, 363; Stern's *Geschichte d. Jud. etc.*, 223, Philippson, *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums*, 1864, 508.

APPENDIX A

[29] All these points touched by the author only *en passant* (comp. below, pp. 329, 351, and 410), which concern also the division of the sections in the Midrash Rabbah, have been treated by Rapoport, Dérenbourg, Bloch, Friedmann, Theodor, and lastly by A. Epstein in his book מקדמוניות היהודים or "*Beiträge zur jüdischen Alterthumskunde*" (pp. 57-63), in which the reference to these authors will be found and to which may be added Graetz's article *Ueber die Entwicklung der Pentateuch-Perikopen-Vorlesung* (*Monatsschrift*, 1869, 385, *seq*). Dérenbourg's other article, *La section de Mischpatim* in *Revue des Etudes Juives*, III, 284 and J. Brüll's remarks in the *Beth Talmud*, I, 108. About the Haftarahs, and those from the Psalms in particular, see Rapoport, *'Erek Millin s. v.* אפטרתא; *Monatsschrift*, 1862, 222, and lastly Graetz, *Kritischer Commentar zu den Psalmen*, I, p. 8, *seq.* [Theodor, *Die Midraschim zum Pentateuch und der dreijährige Palästinensische Cyclus*, *Monatsschrift*, 1885–87; Büchler, *The Reading of the Law and the Prophets in a Triennial Cycle*, *JQR*, *V*, 420–68; VI, 1–73]—We have to remark here that in this, as well as in the following notes, we shall only give references to essays and books which we cannot presume to be known to every student, and we shall thus leave out the references to the histories of Herzfeld, Graetz, and Weiss, with which every Hebrew scholar is acquainted. Nor shall we give references to subjects relating to Bible criticism or the composition of the Apocrypha, as the authorities about any particular point might be easily ascertained in every larger theological

encyclopedia. [New editions of Midrashim and recent literature on them which can be found in Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrash*, fifth edition, Munich, 1921, are as a rule not added to these notes.]

[30] See Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, II, p. 8, note, to which Dr. Neubauer's essay *On the Dialects Spoken in Palestine in the Time of Christ*, Oxford, 1885, has to be added.

[31] It is hardly necessary to call attention here to the authors of the critical school who wrote on the same books both before (De Wette) and after Zunz. We shall only refer here to Zunz's studies in Bible criticism of a later date in his *Gesammelte Schriften*, I, 217-270, where it is clear that he followed most advanced schools in more respects than one. Comp. Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, V, 364.

[32] See a large list of authorities on these points in Schürer, p. 143, and note 124 on p. 291, to which Krochmal's מורה נבוכי הזמן (chapters 11, 12, and 13) may be added.

[33] See *Ben Chananjah*, X, *Forschungen*, p. 221, *seq.* [L. Löw, *Gesammelte Schriften*, IV, Szegedin, 1898, p. 211, *seq.*]

[34] See below, p. 57, *seq.*, and 231, *seq.* See also Rapoport '*Erek Millin*, 6, *seq.*

[35] See אגרות שי"ר, p. 94.

[36] See Krochmal's work cited above p. 187, *seq.* [see also below, article Talmud, notes.]

[37] [See below, article Talmud, note 14.]

[38] [See the literature on the Tosefta problem in Strack, *Einleitung*[5], 75–76; comp. *JQR*, NS. XIII, 354.]

[39] [See article Talmud.]

[40] [See Brüll, *Die Entstehung des babylonischen Talmud als Schriftwerk* in his *Jahrbücher*, II, 28 *seq*; Epstein, *REJ*, XXXVI, 222–367.]

[41] [On the decay of the Babylonian schools much fresh material has come to light from the Genizah in Schechter's *Saadyana* and elsewhere.]

[42] [Schechter found a fuller text of this book in Mss. and intended a critical edition; see Neubauer, *Medieval Jewish Chronicles*, I, p. VI, note 5; II, p. VIII *seq.*]

[43] See Reifmann's pamphlet משיב דבר, Vienna, 1866.

[44] See Jellinek, *Beth ha-Midrasch*, 3, p. XXIX.

[45] See above, note 34; comp. also Dérenbourg's essay on the Tractate Yoma in the *REJ*, VI, 41, and Lerner's article *Die ältesten Compositionen der Mischna* in *Magazin*, 1886, I. Again J. Brüll's מבוא המשנה and J. Oppenheim, תולדות המשנה.

[46] See the treatises mentioned above, note 37.

[47] See Kirchheim's edition of the שבע מסכתות קטנות ירושלמיות; Brüll's essay on the tractate Semahot (*Jahrbücher*, I, 1, *seq.*) and Masseket Kallah published by Coronel in his חמשה קונטרסים (Vienna, 1867).

[48] See Steinschneider's edition of the משנת המדות, Berlin, 1864.

[49] See Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 277.

[50] See Steinschneider, *Ibid.*, p. 277, note 32; Pineles, דרכה של תורה, p. 257. Zunz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, III, 242, Graetz, *Monatsschrift*, 1884, 46, and Epstein, *Beiträge*, 18–22. [*Hebräische Bibliographie*, XVII, 8–10.]

[51] See J. Müller's introduction to his critical edition of this tractate (Leipzig, 1878). See also אגרות שי"ר, p. 77.

[52] See above. The last essay on this book is by Reifmann, *Beth Talmud*, III, 242. [Ginzberg, *Geonica*, I 75 *seq*; Kaminka in *Schwarz-Festschrift*, 431, *seq*].

[53] See above. See also Halberstam's introduction to the הלכות פסוקות, Paris (1886), where all the references on the subject are given, to which Schorr's in the *Zunz Jubelschrift* (II, 127), Hildesheimer's *Programm Die Vaticanische Handschrift der Halachoth Gedoloth* [and his edition, Berlin, 1888–92, A. Epstein in *Ha-Goren*, III, 46, *seq.*, Ginzberg, *l. c.* 99, *seq.*, Poznanski, *L'original araméen des Halachot Pesoukot*, *REJ*, LXIII, 232–44, J. N. Epstein, *JQR*, N. S., IV, 422–34, and *Jahrbuch der Jüd. literar. Gesellschaft*, XII, 96–131] may be added.

[54] See Zunz, *Die Ritus*, p. 184. Many new collections of the Responsa of the Geonim have been added since. See, *e. g.* the collection edited by Harkavy, p. 341, note 1, [Ginzberg, *Geonica*, II, etc].

[55] See Blumenthals' *R. Meir*, p. 17, *seq.* and Back, *Die Fabel in Talmud und Midrasch*, *Monatsschrift*, 1875–84.

[56] See Lebrecht, *Kritische Lese*, p. 12.

[57] See Brüll, *Entstehung etc. des Tractates Aboth* (*Jahrbücher*,

VII, 1–17) where the references to other authorities are to be found.

[58] See Schechter's introduction to his edition of this tractate.

[59] See Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, pp.41 and 273, note 63; Halberstam, in his notes to the above-mentioned חמשה קונטרסים, pp. 113–115; Tawrogi's edition of the *Derek Erez Zuta* (Königsberg, 1885), and Epstein, *Beiträge*, p. 113.

[60] See above p. 85 note c. See also Güdemann, *Geschichte etc. der Juden in Italien*, pp. 50 and 300, where the literature is collected.

[61] See Jellinek, *Beth ha-Midrasch*, I., p. XX.

[62] See Landshut's edition of the Haggadah (under the title, מגיד מראשית, Berlin 1856). See also Perles in *Graetz–Jubelschrift*, p. 37.

[63] See Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 46 and notes; also Neubauer's introduction to his *Medieval Jewish Chronicles*, p. VII, and notes.

[64] See Steinschneider, *ibid.* 49.

[65] See Jellinek, *Beth ha-Midrasch*, 1, p. XX; 6, p. VII.

[66] [See Steinschneider, *Geschichtsliteratur*, § 9, *Monatsschrift*, XXXIX, p. 28, LXI, p. 7, *seq.*]

[67] See Jellinek, *Beth ha-Midrasch*, 2, p. XXVIII; 3, p. XIV; 5, p. X [Epstein, *Eldad ha-Dani*, Pressburg, 1891; Steinschneider, *Geschichtsliteratur*, § 18; Schloessinger, *The Ritual of Eldad*, Leipzig, 1908.]

[68] Jellinek, *ibid.* 2, XXI, [I. Levi, *REJ*, LXVIII-LXXI].

[69] Jellinek, *ibid.* 2, p, XVIII.

[70] Jellinek, *ibid.* 2. XXIII, and 6, XVII; also Zunz, *Die Synagogale Poesie*, p. 142, *seq.*

[71] See Jellinek, *ibid.* 1, XVIII. See also אוצר הספרים, p. 301 no. 613, and Brüll, *Jahrbücher* IV, 128, note 3.

[72] See Jellinek, *ibid.* 3. p. IX.

[73] About these Midrashim see Jellinek, *ibid.* 1, p. XVII, XXI, 2. p. VII, 6, p. XXI. See also Beer's *Leben Moses etc.* in the *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte des Judenthums*, Leipzig, 1863–1864.

[74] Besides Steinschneider in his Catalogue Col. 1574 and *Jewish Literature*, pp. 77 and 290, see *Magazin*, 1876, Heb. 017 and 153. Geiger's *Zeitschrift*, VII, 215. I. Levi's introduction to his

edition of the תולדות אלכסנדר (in the *Sammelband* of the *Mekize Nirdamin*, II). [Steinschneider, *Geschichtsliteratur*, § 19; ed. Günzburg-Kahana, Berdychev, 1896–1913.]

[75] See Zunz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, III, 98. See also Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, 45–49 and notes about all these Midrashim.

[76] See above, note 31.

[77] See Castelli's introduction to his edition of this book and Epstein's *Beiträge*, p. 43 and 47 [and *REJ*, XXVIII–XXIX]. See Commentary on Sefer Yezirah by R. Judah b. Barzillai, ed. by Halberstam, Berlin, 1885.

[78] See about the contents of this chapter Steinschneider, *ibid.* p. 50 and 105–109 and notes. See also Graetz's essay: *Die mystische Literatur in der gaonäischen Zeit*, *Monatsschrift*, 1859, p. 67, *seq.*

[79] See Blumenthal, *R. Meir* (Frankfurt a. M., 1888), pp. 24 and 134.

[80] See Lerner's *Anlage and Quellen des Bereschit Rabbah* (Berlin, 1882), Abrahams, *The Sources of the Midrash Echa Rabbati*, Dessau, 1881.

[81] See Buber's edition of the Pesikta. See also Jellinek, קונטרס תרי"ג, 48, about the reviews of this edition in which the merits of the chapter are discussed. Comp. also Epstein, *Beiträge*, 61, *seq.*; Friedmann, *Beth Talmud*, V, 1, *seq.*

[82] See Buber's Introduction to his edition of the Tanhuma where this chapter is translated and discussed. Against Buber, Epstein in his pamphlet קדמות התנחומא (Wien, 1886). Weiss *Beth Talmud*, V, 37; Schorr, *he-Haluz*, XII, [Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, VIII, 121, *seq.*]

[83] Besides the authorities cited above, n. 80, see also Friedmann's introduction to his edition of this Pesikta (Vienna, 1880), p. 25. Against Friedmann the review of the edition in the *Monatsschrift*, 1882, p. 284.

[84] See Buber's לקוטים ממדרש אלה הדברים זוטא (Wien, 1885).

[85] Epstein's *Beiträge*, pp. 67, *seq.*, and 76, *seq.* Comp. Jellinek, *Beth ha-Midrasch*, 4, p. XIV, and Buber's introduction to the Tanhuma, 42b, note 2 [and his new edition] about the Aggadath Bereshith. With regard to the seventy names of God, etc.

(262, note c) see Landau's pamphlet *Die . . . Synonyme für Gott, etc.*, Zurich, 1888, p. 5, and note 2, and Salzer's communication on *Midrash Lekah Tob, Magazin*, 1879, p. 149, [Schechter, *Agadath Shir Hashirim*, 82 *seq;* and notes].

[86] See Jellinek, *ibid.* 1, p. XIV and XV; Horowitz, *Sammlung Kleiner Midraschim*, I, 47, and Buber's introduction to ספרי דאגדתא, Wilna, 1886. [Gaster, *Semitic Studies*, 1897, pp. 173–8. Comp. Bacher, *REJ*, XXXV, p. 28].

[87] See Luzzatto's correspondence (אגרות שד"ל), 269 and 605. Comp. also Jellinek, *ibid.* 5, p. XXIX and XXXII.

[88] See Horowitz, cited work, p. 11, and Friedmann, *Beth Talmud*, II, 187.

[89] Besides Steinschneider, *Catalogue*, p. 633, and *Jewish Literature*, p. 53, Horowitz, *Bibliotheca agadica*, I, 1-6, and אגרת פתוחה (appendix to the *Beth Talmud* I), and Epstein, *Beiträge*, p. 19.

[90] See the authorities given above, note 86.

[91] See Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 274, note 73. [Buber, כנסת ישראל I, 309].

[92] See Jellinek, *ibid.* 3, p. XXXV, see also Epstein's new edition of this Midrash (appended to his *Beiträge*).

[93] See Zunz's *Gesammelte Schriften*, III, 251 and 274, 5. See also Buber's introduction to the *Midrash Lekah Tob*, 21a, note 25.

[94] See Jellinek, *ibid.* I, p. XVII. See also Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, 283, note 110.

[95] See Buber's לקוטים ממדרש אבכיר, Vienna, 1883. See also Brüll's *Jahrbücher* VII, 145. [Epstein in *Ha-Eschkol* VI, pp. 204–7.]

[96] See Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, 283, note 108.

[97] מדרש טעמי חסירות ויתירות. See Berliner פליטת סופרים, p. 36, *seq.* [Marmorstein, *Midrash Hasarot we-Yeterot*, London, 1917.]

[98] About these pieces see Jellinek, *ibid.* 2, p. XXVII. See also Horowitz, כבוד חופה (Frankfurt, 1888), p. 6, *seq.* (especially p. 7 about the שמיני אוחותיו). Comp. also Schechter's article on Israel Alnaqua's *Leuchter*, *Monatsschrift*, 1885, 114, *seq.* (especially p. 124, note 1).

[99] See Neubauer's introduction to the book of Tobit, XVIII,

and Epstein's pamphlets *Bereshith Rabbati*, Berlin, 1888 [and R. *Moses ha-Darshan*, Vienna, 1891].

[100] See Buber's introduction to his edition of *Midrash Lekah Tob*, Wilna, 1880, and his edition of this Midrash on Esther in the above-mentioned ספרי דאגדתא; Bamberger's edition of this Midrash on Ruth. Comp. Salzer, *Magazin*, 1879, 149, about this Midrash on the Song of Songs; and Brüll's review of Buber's edition, *Jahrbücher*, V, 132. [on Lamentations ed. Nacht, Frankfurt a. M., 1895, ed. Greenup, London, 1908; on Ecclesiastes, ed. Feinberg, Berlin 1904; on Song of Songs ed. Greenup, London, 1905.]

[101] See Steinschneider, *Catalogue*, col. 2601, and Güdemann, *Geschichte. . . . der Juden in Deutschland*, p. 11, note 1. [Epstein in *Ha-Choker*, I, 1891 and *Ha-Eschkol*, VI].

[102] About similar divisions see Zunz's *Zur Geschichte*, p. 22 and *Gesammelte Schriften*, I, 101.

[103] See Frankel's article *Geist der Palästinenischen und Babylonischen Haggadah*, in the *Monatsschrift*, II and III. Compare his *Introductio in Talmud Hierosolymitanum*, 49–53; Schorr, *he-Haluz*, XI. With regard to 309 note c. see J. Müller's חילוף מנהגים, Vienna, 1878. [Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, IV, 169, *seq*; Finkelscherer in *Lewy-Festschrift*, 153 *seq*.]

[104] With regard to the authority or the authorities touched on by Zunz on p. 315, see Schorr, *he-Haluz*, X, XI, XII; also Horowitz, *Monatsschrift*, 1883, p. 306.

[105] Besides the above mentioned article אגדה in Rapoport's *'Erek Millin* and Krochmal, מורה נבוכי הזמן, see also Weiss, *Beth Talmud*, I, 120, *seq*., Friedmann, *ibid*., Güdemann in the *Zunz-Jubelschrift*, 111, *seq*. See also the reference in אגרות שד"ל, 154 to Zunz, 324, note e.

[106] See the first three chapters; comp. also Freudenthal's treatise *Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift, etc.* (IV *Makkabäerbuch*), p. 4, *seq*. (Breslau, 1869).

[107] See the articles of Krochmal, Weiss, and Rapoport as noticed above, note 105.

[108] See above, note 29.

[109] Besides Lebrecht, *Monatsschrift*, 1852, p. 99, and 1853, p. 97, see also Güdemann, *Geschichte etc. der Juden in Italien*, pp. 17

and 18. [The authenticity of the story of the four captives has at least partly been refuted by Schechter's discovery of Hushiel's letter, *JQR*, XI, 643–50. See Eppenstein, *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Literatur im geonäischen Zeitalter*, Berlin, 1913, p. 149ff.]

[110] See Güdemann, *ibid.*, p. 11, note 2.

[111] See Zunz, the first three chapters of his *Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie.* Comp. P. F. Frankl, *Zunz-Jubelschrift*, 160, and his essay on Kalir in the *Encyklopaedie* of Ersch and Gruber, II Sect., 32, p. 135.

[112] This point about the Franco-German schools of exegetes is fully developed in Zunz's *Zur Geschichte.*

[113] See Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature*, p. 299.

[114] See P. F. Frankl's article in the *Encyclopaedie* of Ersch and Gruber, II Sect., 33, p. 18, note 50.

[115] See Güdemann, *Geschichte . . . . der Juden*, III, 225 and 280. See also Grünbaum, *Jüdisch-deutsche Chrestomathie*, Leipzig, 1882.

APPENDIX B

[116] See *Monatsschrift*, 1868, *Abraham ben Isaak aus Narbonne;* 1869, *Aaron Hakohen;* 1871, 228, *Isaak Or Zarua;* 1885, 303, *Elieser ben Joel Halevi; Magazin*, 1874, 73, *Die Jüdischen Gelehrten v. Orleans; ibid.* 106, *Die Söhne des Jehuda Chassid*; 1875, 21, *Isaak Malki Zedek aus Siponto*; 1877, 17, 1878, 179, *Sir Jehuda Leon;* 1883, 64, *Das handschriftliche Werk Assuphoth*; *Revue des Etudes Juives*, V, 167 and VII, 40, *Simson ben Abraham (of Sens).* [*Abraham ben David aus Posquieres, Monatsschrift* 1873–74; *Zur Geschichte der Juden in Arles*, ibid., 1878–82, *etc.; Gallia Judaica*, Paris, 1897.]

[117] Besides the already mentioned reviews by Beer and Philippson, see notices in *Orient*, 1850, 545 by an anonymous author (comp., however, Steinschneider, *Catalogue;* col. 2778 nr. 20), *Ozar Nehmad*, II, 9. The essays and notices in Zunz's *Gesammelte Schriften*, I, 41, 60, (republication from the *Zur Geschichte*) II. 177, 183, 210, III. 1, 41, 50, 82, 128, 132, 214, 224, 253–273 belong more or less to the same class of literature which the *Zur Geschichte* treats. This is also the case with the pamphlet *Die Monatstage des Kalenderjahres* (Berlin, 1872).

APPENDIX C

[118] See the Rev. A. Loewy's English translation of this chapter in the *Miscellany of Hebrew Literature*, I, 167, *seq.* See also Dr. Beer's review of this book (and also of the *Ritus*) in the *Monatsschrift*, 1859, p. 176, *seq.*

APPENDIX D

[119] [Schechter copied Zunz's additions in his copy of *Zur Geschichte* up to p. 130 and from 304 to 352, in several places of *Die Synagogale Poesie* and all through *Die Ritus*].

[120] [This criticism applies to the second edition of the *G.V.* edited by Dr. N. Brüll for the Zunz-Stiftung, Frankfurt a. M. 1892, which contains only Zunz's own additions, but adds an index].

[121] [The *Synagogale Poesie* was edited for the Zunz-Stiftung by Professor Freimann, Frankfurt a. Main, 1920, with Zunz's own additions and with a supplement containing the sources for the historical facts mentioned in the book. Freimann also published from Zunz's notes *Mitteilungen aus hebräischen HSS.* in *Zeitschrift für Hebräische Bibliographie*, XIX, 1916, pp. 49–64, pp. 123–42].

[122] [See above note 17].

ON THE STUDY OF THE TALMUD

[This essay was first published in the Westminster Review Vol. CXXIII (N. S. L. XVII) 1885, pp. 20–53, occasioned by the appearance of Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (London, 1883)].

[1] The epithet "ill-arranged," although deliberately used, will not be acceptable to all authorities.

[2] Some portions of the Haggadah, however, were written down still earlier. Comp. Frankel, *Introductio in Talmud Hierosolymitanum*, 51a.

[3] The treatises and essays touching the publication of the Talmud are too many to be enumerated here. We would, however, refer to the excellent article, *Ueber die Entstehung des Talmud*, by N. Brüll, which appeared in the second year of his *Jahrbücher für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur*, where the whole of this literature is treated. Besides this, we must point to the third volume of Weiss, *Geschichte der Tradition* (1883).

[4] See Frankel's lecture on the study of the Talmud, p. 16.

The question there raised by Frankel has never yet been satisfactorily answered.

[5] See Weiss, *ibid.*

[6] See Brüll, *ibid.* See also the *Mnemotechnik des Talmuds*, by Jacob Brüll. But the mnemotechnical helps to the Talmud are probably, as Rapoport holds, comparatively modern, and in any case of doubtful assistance.

[7] Out of very numerous instances we may here refer to Nedarim, 25b; comp. *He-Haluz*, XI, p. 7, *seq.*

[8] See N. Krochmal's book, *Moreh Nebuke ha-Zeman*, p. 217, *seq.*, and Rapoport's *'Erek Millin*, pp. 5–9.

[9] See *Teshubot ha-Geonim*, editio Cassel, p. 23b.

[10] In order not to be too prolix, we have here confined ourselves entirely to the Babylonian Talmud, but it will escape no one interested in the matter that the same uncertainties are to be met with in all the old rabbinical writings. Comp. Frankel, *ibid.;* Zunz's *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*; Weiss, *Geschichte der Tradition*, vols. II and III; as well as Lewy's excellent and classic treatise, *Ueber die Mishnah des Abba Saul* (Berlin, 1874), and Schwarz's work on the Tosefta, etc.

[10a] [*Soferim* XV ii, see Nöldeke and Wünsche as quoted by Josef S. Bloch, *Israel und die Völker*, Vienna, 1922, pp. 256–7.]

[11] See Döllinger, *Heidenthum und Judenthum* (Regensburg, 1857), especially the last chapter.

[12] 'Abodah Zarah, 10b.

[13] Megillah, 9b, and parallel passages.

[14] See Mekilta, 38b, Bartolocci, *Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica*, vol. I, pp. 552-642; *Ben-Chananja*, 9th year, Supplement to No. 35; Bacher, *Agada der Amoräer* and other works. We need scarcely add that we have touched upon this important subject with the utmost superficiality, wishing rather to suggest than to draw positive conclusions. One warning, however, may be given in all certainty, namely, that no kabbalist or semi-kabbalist works should be adduced or used in an attempt to sketch out a Talmudic theology. Of all these works, such as *Yezirah*, *Bahir*, the *Zohar*, and others, there is not a single one the early date of which has not been denied by the most competent critics and bibliographers. Whatever the exact epoch to which they belong,

they are at all events posterior to the completed Talmud. See on this point Zunz, Rapoport, Steinschneider, and many others. It is incomprehensible to us how Dr. Schiller-Szinessy (article "Midrash", *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 9th ed., vol. XVI) even if he ventures to oppose this noble band of scholars, should have left the student utterly ignorant that he was dogmatically maintaining a position which all the great authorities have declared to be wholly untenable.

[15] See Reusch, *Index der verbotenen Bücher*, vol. I, p. 45, *seq.* (Bonn, 1883). Rapoport, *'Erek Millin*, sub voce "Edom," and Levinsohn, *Te'udah be-Yisrael*, p. 78, note 6.

[16] See Jellinek, *Kunteros ha-Mefaresh* (Vienna, 1877). [Freimann, *Kunteros ha-Mefaresh ha-Shalem* in *Hoffmann-Festschrift* (Berlin, 1914)].

[17] That the Talmud was not regarded even by medieval Jews in all its parts as religious Scripture, may be gathered from many sources. Comp. the letters in *Hemdah Genuzah*, (Königsberg, 1856), p. 39, *seq.*, and especially p. 41.

[18] Writings like Modena's *Behinat ha-Kabbalah*, which confine themselves to general accusations against the Talmud can make no claim to be regarded as scientific productions. De Rossi's *Meor 'Enayim* (written in the sixteenth century) has every right to be regarded as a critical and scientific work, but its influence among the Jews was exceedingly small.

[19] We need only mention here that grand and deep book *Moreh Nebuke ha-Zeman*, by Krochmal (Lemberg, 1853), Rapoport's *'Erek Millin* and his other larger and smaller works, which are scattered about in different Hebrew periodicals. Especially do we feel it our duty to draw renewed attention here to Zunz's *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* (Berlin, 1832), and Frankel's *Hodegetica in Mishnam* (Leipzig, 1859), which laid the foundation for all true study of the Midrash and the Mishnah. We take this opportunity of expressing our surprise that Schiller-Szinessy in his article on "Midrash" and "Mishnah" (in the 9th edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, vol. XVI) strangely enough thought it fit to make no mention of, or allusion to, these truly fundamental works.

[20] See Luzzatto's observations in his preface to his *Gram-*

matik zum Talmudischen Idiom, p. 10, in Krüger's German translation, Berlin, 1873.

[21] See Jellinek's treatises cited above; Stade's *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1881, pp. 334-338; 1882, pp. 53-72, 177-192. In order to obtain a notion how difficult it often is to find the correct definition of a word or term, see Hoffmann's essay in the above mentioned periodical, 1882, pp. 53–72 upon the single word *Malben*, and Freudenthal's treatise on the term *Hazakah*, in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 1860.

[22] See Jellinek's *Kunteros ha-Mafteah* (Vienna, 1881); and comp. Friedmann in his introduction to *Sifre*, chapter VI.

[23] See *Orient Literaturblatt*, 1840, but the greater part of the translations there enumerated have never yet been published. That since then many good and bad translations of various rabbinical writings have been made is well known. [comp. E. Bischoff, *Kritische Geschichte der Talmud-Übersetzungen*, Frankfurt a. M. 1899.] We may here add that Frankel, in his lecture cited above, declared the Talmud to be untranslatable. [This view was also presented by Friedmann in his דבר על אודות התלמוד, Vienna, 1885.]

[24] *Clementina*, edited by P. de Lagarde, Leipzig, 1865, p. 13, note 5; comp. Nöldeke, in the preface to his *Mandäische Grammatik*, Halle, 1875; and Lebrecht's treatise *Handschriften und erste Ausgaben des Babylonischen Talmuds*, Berlin, 1862.

[25] We mean works like that of Friedmann on the *Mekilta*, Buber on the *Pesikta*, Rabbinowicz on some tractates of the Babylonian Talmud, the *Tosefta*, edited by Zuckermandel, the *Mishnah*, edited by H. Lowe, etc.

[26] Comp., on the one side, Deutsch's famous essay on the Talmud, *Quarterly Review*, October, 1877; and, on the other, Eisenmenger's *Entdecktes Judenthum* (Königsberg, 1711). But these two are merely typical instances out of a long list.

[27] See Frankel in his *Monatsschrift*, 1865, p. 472. Since the time Frankel wrote, a goodly number of fresh instances might be added to his list by way of supplement.

[28] London, 1883. Our references throughout are to the first edition.

[29] *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, edited by Charles Taylor.

[30] That Dr. Edersheim has made considerable use of Delitszch's polemical pamphlet *Jesus und Hillel* is very natural. But Delitszch is too conscientious a scholar to venture as far as Dr. Edersheim, even in the very heat of his conflict with Geiger. As regards the assertion that "Hillel was actually wont to mispronounce words, because his teacher before him had done so" (I, 98), which is based on 'Eduyyot 1.8, it seems a pity that our learned author, even if he did not care to make use of Abraham ben David's Hebrew commentary, should not have looked up Graetz (vol. III, 540). The German historian would have explained to him that Maimonides has mistaken the sense of this passage, which refers not to a "mispronunciation," but to the use of a Biblical name for a certain measure, instead of the usual Talmudical one.

[31] See Neubauer's *Géographie du Talmud*, p. 74, and D. Hoffmann's essay, *Der Oberste Gerichtshof*, Berlin, 1877.

[31a] I, 94; comp. Eisenmenger, I, 331.

[32] 1. 35, note 5, referring to Bezah 5b; comp. I, 98.

[32a] A Baraita is a law or teaching of the Mishnic period, but not taken up into the "authorized version" of the Mishnah, which underlies the Talmud.

[33] Tiberias is a city in Galilee, to which the Sanhedrin had finally migrated after the destruction of the Temple.

[33a] The expression used is a play upon Exodus 14. 11, "Because there were no graves in Egypt hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness."

[34] In not a few passages our learned author might have been aided by Graetz. Comp. his treatment of R. Eliezer ben Hyrqanos (II, 193) with Graetz, vol. IV, note 5, and especially his daring statement in note 2, p. 91, vol. I, that even idolatry was allowed in secret, if life were in danger, with Graetz, vol. IV, p. 173, and note 17, where almost the very opposite of Dr. Edersheim's words appear to be the truth. To ignore Graetz—the greatest Jewish historian—is nowadays impolitic and childish. Graetz is too well known to render such silence of any avail.

[35] See vol. I, pp. 85, 91, 271, 532, 547, 550; II, 41, 237, 290, etc. Comp. Eisenmenger, vol. I, pp. 576, 615: vol. II, pp. 41, 215, 227, 242, 605, and McCaul, *Old Paths*, I–IV.

[36] Dr. Edersheim has much to say about the absurdities of the Talmudic Sabbath Law (Appendix XVII, vol. II), its burdensome details, and so on. But those who are most intimately acquainted with the Jews, who both in eastern and western Europe fulfil these innumerable "observances and ordinances," know best that the Sabbath Day is a day of gladness and delight, on which no sense of burden or painful obligation makes itself felt.

[37] Out of a considerable list, we will here draw especial attention to Weber, *System der alt-synagogalen Theologie* (Leipzig, 1880) which attempts, on the strength of a supposed legalism running through the whole Rabbinic literature, to construct an elaborate and connected system of Rabbinical theology. But these favorite epithets, 'legalism', 'want of contact with God,' 'abstractness', and so on are little more than empty phrases to those who are at once most familiar with the spirit of the Rabbinic literature, and also best acquainted with Jewish life as it exists. Weber's book is dangerous because, being attractively written, it is likely to become the recognized authority on this subject; whereas apart from his fundamental prepossessions and misconceptions, his Talmudic knowledge was far too limited to qualify him for such a post of honor.

[38] The words in inverted commas are taken from Dr. Schiller-Szinessy's article on "Midrash" referred to above. There he also reckons up a list of eighteen sciences, ranging from medicine to political economy, and supplemented by three *etceteras*, on which the "philosopher" will find abundant and valuable notices in the various collections of the Midrashim.

THE TALMUD

[This article originally appeared in James Hastings, "A Dictionary of the Bible", Extra Volume, New York, 1904, pp. 57–66.]

[1] See Bacher in *JQR*, IV, 406 ff.

[2] See Weiss, *Dor Dor we-Dorshaw*, I, p. 54; Kuenen, in his essay '*Ueber die Männer der grossen Synagoge*' (occupying pp. 125-160 of the *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur Biblischen Wissenschaft von A. Kuenen*, Freiburg and Leipzig, 1894), contests the ex-

istence of such an assembly (comp. also article "Synagogue, the Great", in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible vol. IV, and the literature cited at the end of that article); whilst D. Hoffmann (*Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, X. 45ff.) and S. Krauss (*JQR*, X, 347 ff.) try to refute his argument. On the whole the present writer is inclined to admit that there is an element of truth in this tradition regarding the Great Assembly. The Judaism which emerges suddenly after this nebulous period is essentially a product of the Synagogue. It is hard to see how it could ever have thriven under the care of the historical [heretical?] priests or the cosmopolitan *Sofer* of the moderns; and such a Synagogue would naturally have developed under the auspices of an authority which acted in conformity with the spirit of the ordinances, decrees, and teachings attributed by the Rabbis to the men of the Great Assembly.

[3] See Weiss, *ibid.*, p. 66. The high priest Simon the Just (probably Simon I., *c.* 300 C.E.) is supposed to have belonged to this Remnant, but the saying recorded in his name is really *soferic* in its character: 'On three things the world is stayed: on the Torah and on the Worship, and on the bestowal of Kindnesses' (Abot 1. 2). Of his successor (second in the *soferic* line), whose name Antigonos of Soko shows already a marked Hellenistic influence, only the following saying is known: 'Be not as slaves that minister to the Lord with a view to receive reward, but be as slaves that minister to the master without a view to receive reward' (*ibid.* 1. 3). This saying, which has a certain Stoic savor about it, is supposed to have given rise to two heretical sects.

[4] See C. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers* (second edition), p. 14, note 9, for the chronology.

[5] For literature on this point, see Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*, II, pp. 188ff. Of special importance are Kuenen, *loc. cit.*, pp. 49-81; Hoffmann, *Die Präsidentur im Synedrium* (*Mag.* v. 1878, pp. 94-99); and Jelski, *Die innere Einrichtung des grossen Synedrion*, etc. Wellhausen's, *Die Pharisäer und Sadducäer* must be taken with great caution, as his command of the rabbinic sources is imperfect.

[6] For the historical and theological significance of this

method of interpretation, see Chwolson, *Das letzte Passamahl Christi und der Tag seines Todes* (St. Petersburg, 1892), p. 20 ff.

[7] Some authorities number five generations of Tannaim. For the purpose of brevity, we have accepted the plan of those who have condensed them into four. For the same reason, we have confined ourselves to the most important Tannaim, omitting many who deserve mention. Compare H. L. Strack's excellent monograph *Einleitung in den Talmud*[2], p. 76 ff. [[5]p. 116 ff.], and his bibliography appended to each Tanna. The references there given include those to Bacher's works, which are the most important contributions to the subject in any language other than Hebrew.

[8] Status constructus משנת. The patristic δευτέρωσις (see references in Schürer, *loc. cit.*, p. 88, n. 1) speaks for משנה (second to the Torah). Both explanations are represented in rabbinic literature. Comp. '*Aruk Completum*, *s. v.* משנה.

[9] For this 'higher criticism' of the Mishnah, see Dr. Lewy, *Über einige Fragmente aus der M. des Abba Saul* in *Zweiter Bericht über die Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, Berlin, 1876, and D. Hoffmann, *Die erste Mischna*, Berlin, 1882. [L. Ginzberg, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Mischna* in *Hoffmann-Festschrift*, Berlin, 1914, and '*Tamid the oldest treatise of the Mishna*' in *Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy*, I, Cincinnati, 1919; Ch. Albek, *Untersuchungen ueber die Redaktion der Mischna*, Berlin, 1923].

[10] See Hoffmann, *loc. cit.*, p. 15: but comp. also A. Büchler, *Die Priester und der Cultus im letzten Jahrzehnt des Jerusalemischen Tempels* (Wien, 1905), p. 10.

[11] See S. Schechter's Introduction to his edition of *Aboth de Rabbi Nathan*, Vienna, 1887.

[12] See Joel Müller's Introduction to his edition of the *Masseket Soferim*, Leipzig 1878.

[13] See N. Brüll, *Die Talmudischen Tractate über Trauer um Verstorbene* (*Jahrbücher* I, pp. 1-57).

[14] See on these Midrashim: I. H. Weiss' introduction to his edition of the *Sifra* (Vienna, 1862); M. Friedmann's Introduction to his edition of the *Mekilta* (Vienna, 1870); Dr. Lewy, *Ein Wort über die 'Mechilta des R. Simon'* (Breslau, 1889); and Dr. D. Hoffmann, *Zur Einleitung in die halachischen Midraschim*

(Berlin, 1886-87); [and his introductions to *Mechilta de Rabbi Simon b. Iochai*, Frankfurt a. M, 1905; *Midrasch Tannaim zum Deuteronomium*, Berlin, 1908–9; H. S. Horovitz's Introduction to his edition of *Sifre* and *Sifre Zuta* to Numbers, Leipzig, 1917; and his *Beiträge zur Erklärung und Textkritik der Mechilta des R. Simon*, Breslau, 1919].

[15] See Friedmann's introduction to the Mekilta, p. LXXVI, and L. Dobschütz' brochure, *Die einfache Bibelexegese der Tannaim* (Breslau, 1893).

[16] See *JQR*, IX, 120.

[17] Neither the Jerusalem nor the Babylonian Talmud extends over all the 60 (or 63) tractates of the Mishnah. The Jerusalem Talmud has Gemara to the first four orders of the Mishnah and to three chapters in the tractate *Niddah* in the sixth order; but in the second order there is missing the Gemara to the last four chapters of the tractate *Shabbat*, and in the fourth order to the third chapter of the tractate *Makkot*, and the tractates *Abot* and *'Eduyyot*. The Babylonian Talmud has Gemara as follows: in the first order to tractate *Berakot* only; in the second order, tractate *Shekalim* is omitted; in the fourth order, tractates *Abot* and *'Eduyyot* are omitted; in the fifth order, tractates *Middot* and *Kinim* are omitted; in the sixth order, Gemara to tractate *Niddah* alone.

[18] It is this discursiveness which makes a proper translation of the Talmud almost impossible; see Friedmann's brochure דבר על אודות התלמוד, Vienna, 1895.

[19] On all these points see N. Brüll's essay, *Die Entstehungsgeschichte des bab. T. als Schriftwerkes* (*Jahrbücher* II, pp. 1–127); and Weiss, as above, vol. III, pp. 208ff., and vol. IV, p. 1ff.

[20] The question whether the Jerusalem Talmud ever had Gemara to the fifth order is best discussed in the *He-Chalutz* XI,33 ff. by Osias H. Schorr, who on excellent grounds maintains that such a Gemara must have existed. But it must be stated that hitherto, not even in the Cairo collections, which have restored to us so many lost works, has a single line turned up to confirm Schorr's hypothesis. About the peculiarities of the fourth order, see I. Lewy, *Interpretation des 1. Abschnittes des paläst. Talmud Traktats Nesikin* (Breslau, 1895), p. 20; but compare also the references

to the other authorities there given. This essay is the best piece of work yet done on the redaction of the Jerusalem Talmud.

[21] A good bibliographical account of the various reprints of the Babylonian Talmud is to be found in Rabbinowicz's מאמר על הדפסת התלמוד, (Munich, 1877), whilst a short list of the various MSS. in the different libraries is given by Strack in his *Einleitung*. It should, however be noted that the last 20 years have brought to light many talmudical pieces, not known to any bibliographer. They are still awaiting description. Mr. Elkan N. Adler's library (London) [now in the Jewish Theological Seminary of America] is especially rich in early prints not known to Rabbinowicz; whilst the Cambridge collections, both in the possession of the University Library and in that of Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson (now in Westminster College), contain many MS. fragments of the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds of the highest critical value. [The latter are published by L. Ginzberg, *Yerushalmi Fragments from the Genizah* (New York, 1902).]

NOTES OF LECTURES ON IEWISH PHILANTHROPY

[1] Yoreh De'ah, 247-259.
[2] Psalms, 24.1.
[3] Genesis, 1.1.
[4] I Chronicles, 29.14.
[5] Ethics of the Fathers, 3.8.
[6] Aggadat Shir ha-Shirim, ed. Schechter, p. 67.
[7] Derek Erez Zuta, sec. IV.
[8] Haggai, 2.8.
[9] Proverbs, 3.9.
[10] Pesikta Rabbati, ed. Friedmann, p. 126b.
[11] *Ibid.*
[12] Leviticus, 25.23.
[13] Hullin, 139a.
[14] Psalms, 24.1.
[15] Kiddushin, 1.6; comp. Rosh ha-Shanah, 6a.
[16] Berakot, 35a.
[17] Psalms, 37.21.
[18] Pesikta Rabbati, ed. Friedmann, p. 200b.

[19] Psalms, 24.1.
[20] Ethics of the Fathers, 3.8.
[21] Leviticus, 25.55.
[22] *Ibid.*, 25.39-42.
[23] Sifra, ed. Weiss, p. 109d.
[24] Exodus, 21.6.
[25] Leviticus, 24.55.
[26] Yerushalmi, Kiddushin, 59d.
[27] Deuteronomy, 14.1.
[28] Hosea, 2.1.
[29] Leviticus, 25.25.
[30] *Ibid.*, 35.
[31] *Ibid.*, 35.
[32] *Ibid.*, 39.
[33] Deuteronomy, 15.7.
[34] *Ibid.*, 9.
[35] *Ibid.*, 11.
[36] Yerushalmi, 34.4.
[37] Nehemiah, 5.7.
[38] Tanhuma, Shemot, ed. Buber, p. 43a; comp. Shemot Rabbah, 22. 24, and Mekilta, *ad loc.*
[39] Yalkut Makiri, Isaiah, p. 232; comp. Baba Batra, 9b.
[40] Wayyikra Rabbah, 34.15.
[41] Psalms, 41.2.
[42] Wayyikra Rabbah, 34.1.
[43] Hagigah, 5a.
[44] Sifre, ed. Friedmann, p. 98a, notes 11-12. Comp Baba Mezi'a, 31b.
[45] Yerushalmi Peah, 5; comp. Wayyikra Rabba, 34.1.
[46] Baba Batra, 8b, 10a, Ketubot, 67b.
[47] Midrash Tannaim, ed. Hoffmann, p. 83.
[48] Yerushalmi, Peah, 5.
[49] Ketubot, 67b.
[50] Shemot Rabbah, 31.15.
[51] Psalms, 136.25.
[52] Wayyikra Rabbah, 34.2.
[53] Proverbs, 19.17.
[54] *Ibid.*, 22.7.

[55] Wayyikra Rabbah, 34.2.
[56] Wayyikra Rabbah, 34.16.
[57] *Shibhe ha-Ari.*
[58] Leviticus, 25.55.
[59] Deuteronomy, 14.1.
[60] Baba Batra, 10a.
[61] See Ulhorn, p. 13.
[62] *Ibid.*
[63] Proverbs, 3.12.
[64] Berakot, 5a.
[65] Shabbat, 55a.
[66] Berakot, 5a.
[67] Comp. Semahot, 10.
[68] See Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 4, pp. 19-20.
[69] A good deal was written about the meaning of the two terms and their relation to one another.
[70] Isaiah, 32.7.
[71] Amos, 8.4.
[72] Psalms, 9.13; 10.12.
[73] Isaiah, 41.17.
[74] Psalms, 70.6.
[75] Psalms, 40.18. See A. V.: "*But* I am poor and needy, *yet* the Lord...." It really means: "*Because* I am poor and needy, *therefore* the Lord thinketh of me." As one would say, I am your poor, helpless little boy.
[76] Shemot Rabbah, 21.4.
[77] Psalms, 10.11, 14.
[79] Exodus, 22.24.
[80] Isaiah, 49.13.
[81] Proverbs, 19.7.
[82] I Chronicles, 29.12.
[83] Shemot Rabbah, 31.5.
[84] *Ibid.*, 13.
[85] Midrash Tannaim, p. 84.
[86] Wayyikra Rabbah, 34.9.
[87] Pesikta, ed. Buber, p. 100a; also Tanhuma, ed. Buber, Deuteronomy 17.
[88] Deuteronomy, 10.18.

[89] Psalms, 68.6.

[90] Numbers, 18. 20. See Midrash Tannaim, Hoffmann's edition, p. 94.

[91] Deuteronomy, 16.11.

[92] Tanhuma, ed. Buber, p. 106.

[93] Aggadat Shir ha-Shirim, p. 27. See Midrash Tannaim, p. 83.

[94] Isaiah, 29.19.

[95] Psalms, 69 30-36.

[96] Shemot Rabbah, 71.1. Comp. Midrash Tehillim, 5. 6.

[97] Isaiah, 48. 10.

[98] Hagigah, 9b.

[99] Seder Eliyyahu Zuta, ed. Friedmann, p. 181.

[100] Hagigah, 9b.

[101] Hagigah, 9b.

[102] Pesikta, ed. Buber, p. 117a; comp. Wayyikra Rabbah, 13. 4. 35. 6; Shir ha-Shirim Rabbah, 1. 24.

[103] Bezah, 25b.

[104] Deuteronomy, 32. 15.

[105] See Al'ami, *Iggeret Musar*, and *Shebet Yehudah*.

[106] Shemot Rabbah, 31. 12; comp. Baba Batra, 116a.

[107] Judges, 17.18.

[108] Baba Batra, 110a.

[109] *Ibid.*

[110] Shabbat, 118a.

[111] Berakot, 8a.

[112] Mekilta, p. 46b.

[113] Unfortunately many conclusions were drawn from these statements by Holdheim and others, which were contrary to the spirit of Judaism.

[114] Berakot, 6b. The word *Kerum* (Psalms 12. 9) comes from the Greek, meaning "color".

[115] *Ibid.*

[116] Proverbs, 15. 15.

[117] Baba Batra, 145b.

[118] *Ibid.*, 64b

[119] Exodus, 4. 19.

[120] Ecclesiastes, 9. 16.

[121] Proverbs, 30. 8-9.
[122] Wayyikra Rabbah, 25. 3. Comp. Midrash Tehillim, 24. 5.
[123] Isaiah, 8. 21.
[124] 'Erubin, 41b.
[125] Pesahim, 111b.
[126] Mishnah Nedarim, 9. 10.
[127] Sanhedrin, 92.
[128] Abot de-Rabbi Natan, 40.
[129] Pirke Abot, 6. 4.
[130] Deuteronomy, 16. 15.
[131] *Ibid.*, 12. 7.
[132] *Ibid.*, 12. 18.
[133] See *ibid.*, 12. 10-19; 14. 22-29; 15. 1-8; 16. 1-17; 15. 12-18.
[134] *Ibid.*, 15. 6.
[135] Joshua, 1. 8.
[136] Deuteronomy, 11. 14.
[137] Sifre, ed. Friedmann, p. 80b.
[138] Shabbat, 33b.
[139] Berakot, 35b.
[140] *Ibid.*
[141] Mekilta, 47b.
[142] Yerushalmi Ma'asrot, 50a.
[143] Mekilta, 47b. This is also found in Sotah, 48b, in the name of R. Eliezer ben Hyrkanos.
[144] Mekilta, p. 46b.
[145] Berakot, 8a.
[146] Pirke Abot, 2. 2.
[147] Abot de-Rabbi Natan, version II, chapter 21.
[148] *Ibid.*
[149] *Ibid.*, 11.
[150] Tanhuma, Bereshit, sec. 26.
[151] Abot de-Rabbi Natan, 11.
[152] *Ibid.*, version II, chapter 21.
[153] Kiddushin, 70a.
[154] See *Hoshen Mishpat*, 8. 4.
[155] See *Ha-Shahar* and other publications of that period.
[156] Deuteronomy, 15. 18; see Sifre, p. 89b.
[157] Pirke Abot, 5: 21.

[158] Abot de Rabbi Natan, version, II, chapter 13.
[159] Mishnah Yebamot, 6. 6.
[160] Yebamot, 61b.
[161] *Ibid.*, 63b.
[162] Ketubot, 63a; Sotah, 4b.
[163] Leon of Modena, 1571-1648.
[164] Psalms, 106. 3.
[165] Ketubot, p. 50a.
[166] *Seder Eliyyahu*, p. 135.
[167] Death prevented the author from carrying out his intention in this respect.

INDEX

INDEX

"Aaron, Midrash on Death of", alluded to, 123.

Ab-Beth-Din, "Father of the House of Judgment," 120; officer of Sanhedrin, 197.

Abadim, "Slaves," minor tractate, alluded to, 210–11.

'Abayi ('Abbayye), Babylonian Amora, alluded to, 218, 268.

Abba Arika, (*Rab*), Babylonian Amora, alluded to, 217; founds School at Sura, 217.

Abba Saul, Tanna, alluded to, 203; Mishnah collection of, utilized by Judah ha-Nasi, 205.

Abbahu, Palestinian Amora, on "study and good works," 177–9; alluded to, 217, 253.

'Abodah, and *'Abodat ha-Shem*, defined, 271.

'Abodah Zarah, "Idolatry," tractate, described, 230.

'Abodah Zarah, "strange work," term confused with idolatry, 260; preferred to poverty, 260.

'Abot, "Fathers," tractate, referred to, 123; 168; 169-70; 182–3; 196, 197; 198–9; 210; described, 230; 264; 274.

'Abot de-Rabbi Natan, minor tractate, referred to, 123; 183; 208; 210.

Abtalyon and Shmayah, "the Great Ones of the Generation," alluded to, 197–8.

Acts of the Apostles, alluded to, 200.

"Adam, the Book of", alluded to, 123.

"Adda and Samuel, Baraita of," alluded to, 122.

Africa, alluded to, 128.

Aggadat Bereshit, Midrashic work, alluded to, 125.

Aggadat Hazita, Midrashic work, 125.

Agrippa I, alluded to, 207.

Agur, supplication of, against poverty, 262.

Aha *Sheeltot* of, alluded to, 122.

Ahad ha-'Am, alluded to, 83.

Ahai, of Be-Hathim, a *Sabora*, alluded to, 222.

Aher. *See* Elisha ben Abuyah.

"Akiba, Rabbi, the Alphabet of," alluded to, 124.

Akiba ben Joseph, on "study and good works," 178; master of many distinguished disciples, 201–2; patriot and martyr, 202; most famous Tanna, 202; skillful interpreter of Scriptures, 202; Mishnah collection of, 120, 210; arrangement of Torah in links, 208; alluded to, 212, 214; discussion with Rufus on charity, 249–52; on suffering as virtue, 252; daughter of, married to Ben 'Azzai, 274.

Akiba ben Joseph, School of, Midrashic works of, 211.

Akilas, Targum of, alluded to, 122.

Alami, quoted by Zunz, 95-6.

Alexandria, alluded to, 27, 32.

Allegorical interpretation of Scripture, the *Sod*, 121.

"Alphabet of Rabbi Akiba, the," alluded to, 124.

Am ha-Arez, "country people," alluded to, 176.

Amemar of Neharde'a, Babylonian Amora, alluded to, 218.

America, hero worship and, 47; alluded to, 129.

Ammi (also Immi), Palestinian Amora, alluded to, 217.

Amoraim, acquainted with original of

Ecclesiasticus, 208; and Tosefta, 209; defined, 216; names of leading, 216–8.
Amos, the prophet, and universal religion, 62.
Andernach, community of, mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela, 6.
'Ani ben Tobin, "impoverished rich," care of, 247, 252.
Animals, precepts against cruelty to, 19–20; precepts on feeding, 20–1.
Anthropomorphistic figures applied to the Diety in the Talmud, 154.
Antioch, alluded to, 63.
Antiochus Epiphanes, alluded to, 119.
Anti-Semitism, German, subtlety of, 24.
Apostasy of Elisha ben Abuyah, alluded to, 202.
Apostles, the, alluded to, 18, 200.
Aquila. *See* Akilas.
Arabs and Jews, contact of, alluded to, 127.
Arakin, "Valuations," tractate, described, 231.
Aramaic idioms and dialects in Talmud, 219; translations of Bible in, deemed insufficient, 119.
Arba Turim. *See* Jacob ben Asher.
Arim, House of, on importance of study, 178.
"Aristeas, Letter of," alluded to, 123, 124.
Aristotle, alluded to, 2, 4, 12, 70, 100.
Arrogance of lay-heads, Zunz on, 93–4.
Artisans, the Rabbis as, 270.
Aruk, alluded to, 114.
"As Others Saw Him," by Joseph Jacobs, reviewed, 25–46.
Asceticism and Judaism, 263–4; as condition of salvation, 264, 267–70, 272; excesses of, and celibacy, 273.
See also Fast; Saintliness.
Asher ben Jehiel, Spanish rabbinical authority, 14; regard for Torah 15; invited to return to Germany, 14–5; on secular science, 15; poverty of family of, 15–6.
Ashi, of Sura, Babylonian Amora, began compilation of Talmud, 148; 218.
Ashkenaz, term explained, 1; occurs in Genesis, 1; identified with Germany, 1; identfied with other portions of Europe, 1; contrasted with Sephard, 2; scientific method of exegesis of rabbinical scholars of, 5, 12–3; modesty of rabbinical scholars of, 12–4.
Ashkenaz, the Jews of, under Christian potentates, 2; not great organizers, 3; reasons for lack of scientific culture of, 3–4; distinguished spiritually, 4–5; mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela, 6–7; Crusades and, 7–9, 16–7: affiinty of prayer-book of, with Palestinian ritual, 8; devotion to authority of the Torah, 12; martyrdom of, 17; persecutions cause migrations to Poland and Turkey, 23–4.
See also Germany; Saints; Sephard.
Assi (also Issi), Palestinian Amora, alluded to, 217.
Assimilation, Jewish religious life as antidote to, 78.
Azulai, alluded to, 88.

Baal Shem, *See* Israel Baal Shem.
Baba Batra, "Last Gate," tractate, example of treatment of Mishna cited, 220; described, 229.
Baba Kamma, "First Gate," tractate, quoted, 213; described, 229.
Baba Mesi'a, "Middle Gate," tractate, described, 229.
Babylon, R. Judah on emigration from, to Palestine, 64; "Feast of Rejoicing of the Law" first introduced in, 118; reciting Haftarot on Sabbath afternoon service, customary in, 118.
Babylonian Amoraim, list of important 216–8; *Rab*, title of, 216.

Babylonian Talmud, reduced to writing, 218; "the Talmud of the People of the East," 219; dialects of, 219; style of, 219; compared with Jerusalem Talmud, 219, 222; Palestinian authorities quoted in, 222.
See also Talmud, the.
Bachelors. *See* Celibacy.
Baneth, Mordecai, alluded to, 56, 73, 83.
Baraita, alluded to, 120, 122, 124, 174; defined, 209; scattered quotations of, in Talmud, 209.
Baraita de-Rabbi Eliezer, chapter on, in *G. V.*, 124-5.
Baraita Meleket ha-Mishkan, alluded to, 122.
Bartolocci, Christian Hebraist, alluded to, 88.
Bat Kol, the, and Isaac Luria, 249; and Simon ben Yohai, 268.
Beelzebub, alluded to, 37.
Beer, Peter, alluded to, 74, 130.
Behinat ha-Kabbalah, disputes law of propagation, 275.
Bekorat, "First Born," tractate, described, 231.
Bemidbar Rabbah, Midrashic work, alluded to, 125.
Ben 'Azzai, Tanna, on celibacy, 274.
"Ben Sira, the Wisdom of." *See* Ecclesiasticus.
Bendavid, alluded to, 89.
Benediction, preceding martyrdom, 9, 17.
See also Grace, Prayer.
Benevolence. *See* Charity.
Benjamin of Tudela, on Ashkenaz Jewish communities, 6—7.
Berakot, "Benedictions," tractate, on repentant sinner, 190; example of Mishnah literature in, cited, 221, described, 226.
Bereshit Rabbah, Midrashic work, alluded to, 124.
Berlin, Hochschule in, 48; Zunz as preacher at, 113.
Bet Din, authority of, in time of Jesus, 34.
Bet Hillel. *See* Hillel, School of.
Bet Shammai. *See* Shammai, School of.
Beth Shearim, meeting place of Sanhedrin, 203.
Bezah, "Egg", tractate, quoted, 173; described, 228.
Bible, the, commentaries of the Ashkenazic and Sephardic Jews compared, 12; respected because of noble affinity with Christianity, 100; as testimony of Jewish creed, 110; original language of, little understood, 118–9; need of interpretation of, 119; the Books of, forming part of Tradition, 120; three ways of explaining, 121; Canon of, and the Soferim, 196; Akiba, skillful interpreter of, 202; Scriptures, the Written Law, in contradistinction to Oral Law, 204; knowledge of, assumed by the Mishnah, 205.
See also Derush; *Targum*; Torah, the; and under the various Books of the Bible.
Bikkurim, "First Fruits," tractate, quoted, 206–7, described, 227.
Bingen, community of, mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela, 6.
Biographical literature, Jewish, product of 18th century, 96.
Black-Death, the, persecutions during, 66.
"Blessing of Jacob, the", Midrash to, 125.
Bonn, community of, mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela, 6.
"Book of the Saints", by Judah ha-Hasid, quoted 20–1.
"Books of Jubilees", great number of, 47.
Bosniak, Jacob, compiler of Schechter's notes of lectures on Jewish Philanthropy, 238–9.
Broad Church, the, alluded to, 68.
Brotherhood of Man, the, Biblical quotations on, 244–5.

Buber, Solomon, alluded to, 138.

Cabbala, *See* Kabbala; Mysticism; Tradition.
Caesarea, alluded to, 177, 217.
Caliphs, the civilization of, shared by Sephardic Jews. 2.
Candia, alluded to, 129.
Canon, Biblical, the, and the Soferim, 196; discussed in Talmud, 220.
See also Bible.
Capital Punishment, authority of Sanhedrin to inflict, 171.
Carlyle, quoted, 11, 49, 56.
Caro, D., Hebrew translation by, of Zunz's *G. V.*, 102; unpublished, 103.
Caro, Joseph. *See* Joseph Caro.
Castile, Spain, alluded to, 14.
Catholic Israel, term designating "All Israel," 11.
Celebrities, Jewish, Zunz on social position of, 97.
Celibacy, prohibition of, 273–5; unhealthy social influence of, 273.
See also Saintliness.
Censor, disfigurement of Talmud by, 161, 186.
Chajes, author of *Iggeret Bikkoret*, alluded to, 102.
Charity, precept on aiding destitute poor, 20; "study and good works," 194–7; not a product of Christianity, 239; giving of, in secret, 247; pagan conception of, 250–2; as gift of God, 266.
Charity, Christian, works on, 239; claims of superiority of, 239–40.
Chasidim. *See* Saints.
Chastity, precept on, 20.
Cheating, admonitions against, 20–1.
Child, Jewish, the, influence of Old Testament on, 188.
Children of God, humanity as, 243.
Children of Israel, as servants of God, 243.
Choriner, Aaron, rabbi, alluded to, 141.
Christ. *See* Jesus.
"Christian Charity, History of", by Ulhorn, referred to, 239.
Christian and Rabbinical doctrines, Edersheim on divergency of, 164.
Christian Hebraists, service of, to Jewish scholarship, 88.
Christian Movement, the, among Jews, 81.
Christian, *Nokri*, Talmudic term for, discussed, 186.
Christian scholars and the Talmud, 161.
Christianity, superior claims of, challenged by Geiger, 87; Israel greater than, 45.
See also Christian; Christians; Jesus.
Christians, inability of, to understand spirit of the Law, 240.
Christians, early, recruited from lower classes, 27.
"Chronicle of Moses, the," Midrashic work, 123.
Chronicles, chapter on, in *G. V.*, analyzed, 119.
Chronicles, the Book of, alluded to, 109, 119, 215; Midrash to, 125.
Chwolson, Daniel, alluded to, 32, 35.
Circumcision, considered relic of barbarism by Geiger, 66; abolition of, suicidal to Judaism, according to Zunz, 112.
Cistern, as symbol for receptiveness of Rabbis, 182.
Classics, Greek and Latin, study of, compared with Hebrew, 158.
Coblenz, community of, mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela, 6.
Code, Rabbinical. *See Mishneh Torah.*
Cohn Albert, hopes for Palestinian restoration, 63; ridiculed by Geiger, 63.
Cohen, Elijah. *See* Elijah Cohen.
Cohen, Raphael, of Hamburg, alluded to, 74.
Cologne, Jews of, first mentioned by Constantine, 3; mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela, 6.
Commentary, Biblical, the Midrash as a sample of, 214.

Commentators, Ashkenazic, modesty of, compared with Sephardic, 12–3
Commentators, to Mahzor, great number of, in Germany, 9–10.
Competition, with neighbor in buying, precept against, 20–1.
Confession of sin. *See* Penitent; Sin and Repentance.
Constantine, Edict of, mentions Jews, 3; persecutions under reign of, 218.
Cooper Fennimore, novels of, alluded to, 3.
Corinth, alluded to, 27.
Creation, Geiger's view of, 59.
Creation, the "Secret of," mystic work of, 124.
Criticism, the Higher. *See* Exegesis, Biblical.
Cromwell, alluded to, 67.
Crusades, the, and Ashkenaz Jews, 16, 22, 66.
Cuti, Talmudic designation for Samaritan, 186.
See also Kutim.

Da Costa, Joseph, alluded to, 95.
Dammai, the "Doubtful," tractate, described, 226.
Dancing, rules for behavior at, 93.
Daniel, the Book of, contains germs of haggadic Midrash, 109, 119; Additions to, "Daniel, the Book" of, Haggadic work, 122.
Darshan, the, lecturer, alluded to, 128.
Daughter-Voice, the. *See Bat Kol.*
David, the House of, Hillel descendant of, 198.
David, King, alluded to, 241.
Day of Judgment, the, cruelty to animals punishable on, 19.
Debarim Zuta, Midrashic work, alluded to, 125.
Deity, the, fanciful conceptions of, in Talmud, 154–5.
Del Medigo, Joseph, portrait of, alluded to, 96.
Derash, homiletical interpretation of Scriptures, 121.
Derek Eretz Rabbah and *Zuta*, minor tractates, alluded/to, 123.
Derenbourg, alluded to, 35; correspondence of, with Geiger, 52.
Deronda, Daniel. See Eliot, George.
De Rossi, Azariah, alluded to, 88.
Detmold, birthplace of Zunz, 84.
Deuteronomy, the Book of, quoted, 84, 172, 173, 174, 175, 189, 199, 205, 210, 211, 215–6, 227, 228, 229, 230.
Deutsch, Emanuel, alluded to, 144; exaggerated praise by, of Talmud, 161.
Dialogue style of Midrash, cited, 214.
Dictionaries and grammars of the Talmud, 236–7.
Dietary Laws, the, and Jewish mystics 18; Geiger on, as obstacles to progress, 67.
Disciples. *See Talmidim.*
Disraeli, Benjamin, alluded to, 14.
Divine Glory. *See Shekinah.*
Divine Presence. *See Shekinah.*

Ecce Homo, by Martineau, alluded to 26, 29.
Ecclesiasticus, included under Haggadic literature, 123, 124, 208; Rabbinical teachers and geonim aware of existence of original Hebrew of, 208; on poverty, 261.
Edersheim, Dr., *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, by, discussed, 163, 193; written in appropriate and inviting style, 164; aims to establish divergence of Christian and Rabbinical doctrines, 164–5; not acquainted with Jewish commentators, 166; biassed student, 166; keen controversialist, 166; uses opprobrious epithets on the Rabbis, 167; entertains favorable views of Hillel and Gamaliel, 167; quotes Rabbis who lived after Jesus, 168;

modifies view on Hillel, 168; on Hillel's negative admonitions, 168; on vainglory of Rabbis, 169, 172–3; on excessive respect paid Scribes, 170; on power to repeal ordinances, 176; on tradition being set above Writ, 176; on supreme merit of "study" as against "good works", 176–180; mistranslates individual words, 180; on Rabbinical attitude toward Gentiles, 183; on religion and theology of the Rabbis, 187; on Rabbinical conceptions of sin and repentance, 188, 191; illustration of superficial treatment accorded Rabbinical literature, 191; critics should read Talmud, 193.
Edict of Constantine mentioning Jews, 3.
'Eduyyot, "Evidences," tractate, alluded to, 193, 198; described, 230.
Eger, Akiba, alluded to, 56, 73, 83.
Egypt, alluded to, 128.
Ehrenberg, Samuel Mayer, alluded to, 86.
Eighteen Benedictions, the, alluded to, 196.
Eisenmenger, abuse by, of Talmud, 161, alluded to, 169, 183.
Eldad ha-Dani, haggadic work, alluded to, 123.
Eleazar ben Arak, alluded to, 182.
Eleazar ben Azariah, president of Academy of Jamnia, alluded to, 201, 212, 213.
Eleazar of Modi'in, quoted, 269.
Eleazar ben Pedat, Palestinian Amora, alluded to, 217.
Eleazar ben Shamu'a, disciple of Akiba, alluded to, 203.
Eliezer, Rabbi, alluded to, 174–5.
Eliezer ben Hyrkanos, and "halo of light," 35; head of Lydda School, 201; disciple of Hillel yet cherishes Shammaitic principles, 201; excommunicated, 201.
Eliezer ben Jacob I, alluded to, 201.
Eliezer ben Jehudah, of Worms, on holiness and self-denial, 22.
Eliezer ben Jose of Galilee, "Thirty-two Rules of Interpretation" of, referred to, 122, 211.
Elijah, Gaon of Wilna, alluded to, 74.
Elijah Cohen, author of *Me'il Zedakah*, alluded to, 240.
Eliot, missionary, alluded to, 80.
Eliot, George, Zunz's quotation used by, in *Daniel Deronda*, 111.
Elisha ben Abuyah, (*Aher*), apostasy of, alluded to, 202.
Emerson, quoted, 114.
England, alluded to, 129.
Epitaphs, on tombs of Zunz and his wife, 142.
Epstein, Abraham, alluded to, 3.
'Erubin, "Amalgamations," tractate, described, 227.
Eschatology of Talmud, 184.
Eshkoloth, title of first "Pair," Talmudic teachers, 198.
"Essenes, the Meditations of", haggadic work, 124.
Essenes, the, and wonder-working, 30; sect within Judaism, 267.
See also Essenism.
Essenism, Israel greater than, 45.
Esther, Queen, alluded to, 5.
Esther, the Book of, quoted, 5.
Esther, the Book of, Additions to, haggadic work, alluded to, 123; Midrash to, 125.
Ethical Haggadah, the, chapters on, in *G. V.*, analyzed, 122–3.
Ethical monotheism, as religion of humanity, 61.
Ethical precepts, quoted, 15; works containing, 122–3.
Ethical teachings of the New and Old Testaments, 81.
"Ethical Wills," alluded to, and quoted, 14, 15, 21–3.
Etiquette, rules of, by Joseph Da Costa, 89.
Euchel, Isaac, alluded to, 5.
Evangelist and Scribe, contrasted by Edersheim, 189.

Evil Desire, the, quotation from *Sifra* regarding, 215.
Exegesis, Biblical, examples of, in Midrash, 214–5.
Exegetical Haggadah, chapter on, in *G. V.*, analyzed, 124.
Exegetical system of Rabbis, growth of, 211.
Exodus, the Book of, alluded to, 173, 174, 206, 208, 211, 212, 213, 214, 221, 227, 228, 229; *Mekilta* on, 211, 215.
Ezekiel, the Book of, alluded to, 109, 120, 124, 214.
Ezra, the Book of, alluded to, 119, *Midrash* to, 125.
Ezra the Scribe, alluded to, 196; Eleazar ben Azariah, descendant of, 201.

Fables of R. Meir, alluded to, 122–3.
Family, the, and charity, 275, 276; as center of benevolence, including all poor, 276.
Fasts, precept against too frequent, 19–20.
"Father of the House of Judgment". *See Ab-Beth-Din.*
Fatherhood of God and poor, 244.
Feeding of dumb creatures, precept on, 20–1.
"Fence" to the Torah and saintly conduct, 17–8.
Ferdinand and Isabella, alluded to, 66.
Firkowitch, Karaite scholar, alluded to, 111.
France, earliest settlement of Jews in, 3; alluded to, 127, 129.
France and Zaddikim-cult, 47.
Francis of Assisi, Renan's admiration for, 75.
Frankel, Z., alluded to, 57, 97, 157, 171, 234.
Frankfort-on-the-Main, Rabbinical conference of 1846, held at, referred to, 75.
French Revolution, rationalistic influence of, on German Jews, 4; and cessation of persecutions, 23; influence on Geiger, 70–1.
Friedlaender, David, alluded to, 5.
Fruits, precept on duty to taste all manner of, 20.

Gallic tribes, virile qualities of, alluded to, 3.
Gamaliel, Rabban, the Elder, alluded to, 41, 167.
Gamaliel II, son (or grandson) of Hillel, 200; president of Academy of Jamnia, 200; at trial of Paul, 200; autocratic in treatment of colleagues, 201.
Gans, Edward, quoted, 87, 89; lack of Jewish sympathies of, 88; convert to Christianity, 88.
Gaon. *See* Geonim.
Gefrorer, opinion of, on Zunz's *G.V.*, 101.
Geiger, Abraham, Stern's biography of, 48; *Leben und Lebenswerk*, commemorating centenary of birth of, 48; distinguished as great scholar, 48; great controversialist and reformer, 48; professor of divinity, 48; Low's, Essay on, as philologist, 49; "twists and prejudices of," 49–50; achievements in history of Jewish sects, 50; genius for heresy hunting, 50; hypothesis on origin of Sadducees, 50; revision necessary of *Die Urschrift*, 51; biography by Ludwig Geiger, 51–2; untenability of some theories of, 52; correspondence of, with Derenbourg, 52; attitude on fasting, 53; controversy with Tiktin, 53–5; disappointment at son's failure to prepare for rabbinate, 54; as *dayyan* in orthodox *Bet-Din*, 54; as theologian, 57–8; philologist rather than theologian, 57–8; *Das Judenthum und seine Geschichte*, alluded to, 57, 67; essay on original sin, 58; the Torah as the

word of God, 58–60; view of creation, 59; folly of Messianic belief, 59; mission-doctrine of Israel, 60; Judaism to become universal religion, 62; Judaism not henotheistic, 62; Israel not a nation, 62; against belief in Messiah, 62; opposed to restoration of Palestine, 62; regards as blasphemous prayer for restoration of Palestine, 63; opposition to Jewish nationality, 63; ungrammatical interpretation of passage in Isaiah, 64; views regarding "Holy" Land, 64; regards Judah ha-Levi's love for Zion morbid, 64; favors abandonment of Hebrew, 66; circumcision a relic of barbarism, 66; "Judgment of History," 66; considers dietary laws as hindrance to progress, 67; hostile to ceremonies and symbols, 67; religious views affect conception of Jewish history, 67; continuity of Jewish history and thought, 68; lacks sympathy for traditional types of Jewish feeling, 68; purpose of Judaism, 69–70; review of Zunz's *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*, 70; product of his time, 72; prophetic Judaism and, 73; weakness of reform position of, 80; on the superiority of Judaism, 81; strove for preservation of Sabbath, 81; rationalism of, product of French revolution, 70–1; alluded to, 97, 104, 161; quoted on Zunz's *G. V.*, 101; on building new religious systems on basis of tradition, 101.

Geiger, Ludwig, biographical essay of Abraham Geiger, 51–2; and the Jewish ministry, 54.

Gemara, the, defined, 219; treatment of Mishnah, examples of, 220–1.

Gematriot, as means of ascertaining authors of anonymous piyyutim, 102.

Gemilut Hasadim, "deeds of loving kindness," 7–8.

Genesis, the Book of, cited, 1, 231.

Gentile, the, precepts against cheating of, 20–2; embittered attitude toward, explained, 153, 183–4.

Geonim, responsa of, product of Jewish belief, 107; haggadic fragments of, 122, 123; story of Four Captured, alluded to, 127; acquainted with Hebrew original of Ecclesiasticus, 208.

Gerim, "Proselytes," minor tractate, referred to, 211.

German Jews, at beginning of 19th century, 76, 90.

German Saints, mentioned in *Tur Orah Hayyim*, 129.

Germany, Jews of, first mention of settlement of 3; persecutions of, 14, 23; alluded to, 127, 128, 129, 132.

Germany, medieval, Jewish saints of, 1, 74; close association with Holy Land, 8.

Gershon, Rabbenu, alluded to, 10.

Geschichte des Erziehungswesens der Juden, by Gudemann, alluded to, 131.

Gestetner, index by, to Zunz's *Literaturgeschichte*, 107.

Gezerot, decrees, 195, 198.

Gittin, "Letters of Divorce", tractate, on treatment of Mishnah, 200; described, 229.

Giza, of Sura, a Sabora, alluded to, 222.

God, longing of Saints for communion with, 9; as viewed in the Talmud, 15, 45; service demanded by, 19–20; on loving, at risk of fortune, 21–3; on religious ecstasy in prayer to, 23; invoking miracles in name of, 37; traditional conception of, 56; as compassionless Father, 68; as soul of Israel, 112; attributes of, 215; *Makom*, the

Omnipresent, on giving praise to, 221; as sole owner of everything, 241–3; men belong to, 243–4; Israel as servant of, 243–4; all children of, 244.
Gospels, the, inadequate source for life of Jesus, 25–7; story of money-changers in the Temple, 34; Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem according to, 39.
Gottesdienstliche Vortrage der Juden, by Zunz, analyzed and reviewed, 99; has neither index nor table of contents, 100; opinions of, by Geiger, Gefrorer, Samiler, and Chajes, 101-2; views of, attacked by Chajes, 102; influence on scientific study of Jewish literature, 101; some features of, antiquated, 103–4; unavailability of, to Polish Jews, 103; *Midrash Halakah* little treated, 104; two defects of, 104; on importance of oral instruction, 108; explains gap between Oral and Written Law, 108; on date of portions of Bible, 108; on continuity of traditionall spirit in Jewish literature, 109–10; analysis of chapters of, 118–31.
Grace, at meals, 243.
Graetz, alluded to, 5, 139, 178.
Grammars and dictionaries of the Talmud, 236–7.
"Great Inarticulate," phrase describing German Jews of Middle Ages, 11.
"Great Interpreters". *See* Shemaiah and Abtalyon.
Greece, alluded to, 127: culture of, Rabbis conscious of, 157.
Greek and Latin, studies of, encouraged, 158; words interspersed in Mishnah, 205.
Gross, author of *Gallia Judaria*, alluded to, 130.
Gudemann, alluded to, 131.
Guest, treatment of, saintly precepts on, 19.
Hadrian, alluded to, 126, 176–7; persecutions of, 127, 172, 178–9, 202.
Haftarot, antiquity of, 118.
Haggadah, literature of, chapters on, in *G. V.* analyzed, 121, 122, 123, 125, 126, 127; later European developments, 127; defined, 146–7, 195; sayings attributed to "Pairs," 197–8; could be recorded, 208; Babylonian Talmud rich in, 222; deep devotion of Palestinian Rabbis to, 224; conception of God as sole owner of everything, 242.
Haggadah, Ethical, chapter in *G. V.*, analyzed, 122–123.
Haggadah, historical, chapter in *G. V.*, analyzed, 123–4.
Haggadah Skel Pesah, alluded to, 123.
Hagigah, "Feast-Offering", tractate, described, 228.
Hagiographa, alluded to 118, 119, 121, 124.
Halakah, the, historical development of, 104; alluded to, 120–121; haggadic fragments in the works of the, 122; defined, 146, 195; Halakot attributed to five "Pairs," 198; Hallakic dicta of schools of Hillel and Shammai, 200; prohibition against writing down, often disregarded, 208; Midrash as aid to exposition of, 212, and Midrash, 212; Biblical sanction through Midrashic interpretation, 213.
Halakot, paragraphs of Mishnah, 204.
Halakot Gedolot, alluded to, 121, 122.
Halo, the, as symbol of prophetic power, 35–6.
Hallah, the "Dough," tractate, described, 227.
Hamburger, Geiger's brother-in-law, alluded to, 53.
Hanan, high-priest, alluded to, 34.
Hanefim, Talmudic term for hypocrites, alluded to, 43.
Harnack, alluded to, 80.
Hasid, Hebrew equivalent for saint,

5–6; hospitality an essential trait of the, 7.
Hasidim, "beautiful souls," 6; literature of, austere yet kindly spirit of, 18–9.
Hazzan, office held in high regard by German Jewish saints, 10–1; paid officer in Spain, 10–1.
Hebraists, Christian, important contributions of, to Jewish literature, 88.
Hebrew language, Geiger favors abandonment of, 66.
Heder attended by Zunz, 85.
Hediot, Talmudic term for priest, discussed, 180–1.
Heilprin, alluded to, 88.
Heine, on Bendavid, 89; on Zunz's lack of popularity, 93.
Hekash, Talmudic term for argument by analogy of matter, 213.
Hekdesh, records of, not preserved, 240.
Hellas, the art and intellect of, Rab conscious of, 153; studies of, encouraged, 158.
Hen, defined, 5.
Heresies as stimulants to religion, 50.
Hermeneutical rules of Hillel, Ishmael, and Eliezer ben Jose of Galilee, 211.
Hero-worship, America and, 47; Mill and Carlyle quoted on, 49.
Herzl, Theodor, alluded to, 84.
Hesed, defined, 5.
High Priests, accusations against, 34–5, 180.
Hillel, alluded to, 41, 199; viewed favorably by Edersheim, 167–8; quoted 168–9; one of the *Zugot*, 197; native of Babylon, 198; descendant of House of David, 198; quoted on loving fellow-creatures, 198; and Shammai, most important "Pair," 198; many Halakot recorded in name of, 198; famous teaching to heathen seeking admission into Judaism, 199; interpretation on sacrificing Paschal Lamb on Sabbath, 199; mild interpreter of tradition, 200; Seven Rules of Interpretation of, 211; expanded into Thirty-two, 211; *Kal va-Homer*, one of hermeneutical rules of, 212; on treatment of impoverished rich, 247; on personal charity, 247.
See also Shammai; Shammai, the House of.
Hillel, Mishnah collections of, utilized by Judah ha-Nasi, 120, 206;
Hillel, the House of, (*Bet Hillel*), alluded to, 126. 198; important teachers, 198, 200; on size of families, 274.
Hirsch, Samson Raphael, alluded to, 84.
Hisda, Babylonian Amora, alluded to, 217.
Historical Haggadah, chapter on, in *G. V.*, analyzed, 123.
History, Jewish, Geiger's views on, 67–8; Zunz condemns lack of interest in, 95–6.
Hiyya, Palestinian Amora, supposed compiler of *Tosefta*, 120, 209, 216–7.
Holdheim, alluded to, 74.
Holiness and saintliness, 22.
Holland, alluded to, 128.
Holy life, the, qualities constituting, 72.
Homiletics. *See Gottesdienstliche Vortrage.*
Horayot, "Decisions," tractate, described, 230.
Horwitz, Ch. M. alluded to, 210.
Hosea, the Book of, alluded to, 109.
Hosha'ya Rabba, Palestinian Amora, supposed compiler of *Tosefta*, 120, 209, 216–7.
Hospitality of Medieval German Jews, 7.
House of Hillel. *See* Hillel, the House of.
House of Shammai. *See* Shammai, the House of.
Hullin, "Things Secular", tractate, described, 231.
Huna of Sura, Babylonian Amora, 217.

Hymns, Ashkenaz, religious fervor of, 17.
Hypocrisy, Pharisaic and Christian, charges and countercharges, 42–3.

Ibn Ezra, alluded to, 100, 111.
Ideas, the supremacy of, over Jews, 91–2.
Idiom of Mishnah, described, 204–5.
Iggeret Bikkoret, by Chajes, referred to, 102.
Immanence, mystic theory of, never lawless or degenerating, 22; theory of, confused, 91.
Incarnation, doctrine of, questioned, 25.
Interpretation. *See* Midrash.
Interpretation, Rules of, alluded to, 201, 211.
Introduction to the Talmud, 235.
Introductio in Talmud Hierosolymitanum, by Frankel, alluded to, 181.
Isaac Lurie and legend of the *Bat Kol*, 249.
Isaac Or Zarua, modesty of, 13.
Isabella of Spain, alluded to, 66.
Isaiah, the Book of, cited 20, 64, 109, 186, 214; Midrash to, 125.
Ishmael, son of Eliezer ben Azariah, Tanna, alluded to, 212, 268.
Ishmael ben Elisha, Tanna, emigrated to Usha and founded school there, 201; alluded to, 201, 212, 214; author of Thirteen Rules of Interpretation, 211; comment on passage in Exodus, 214.
Ishmael ben Elisha, School of, 202, 211; Midrashim emanating from, 211.
Ishmael ben Phiabi, alluded to, 34.
Israel, wedded to the Torah, 5; greater than any Jewish sects, 45; greater than Christianity, 45; Jesus as incarnation of, 46; traditional doctrine of, 56; Geiger on, as a nation, 62; the Synagogue as highest expression of life of, 112; merits of, flow from study and good works, 176–8.
Israel Baal Shem, alluded to, 83.
Israeli, Spanish Talmudists, alluded to, 14.
Italy, alluded to, 127, 128.

Jabneh, Sanhedrin of, authority of, 171.
Jacob ben Asher, author of the *Turim:* quoted 1; on love of prayer by German saints, 9; poverty of, 15–6.
Jacobs, Joseph, *As Others Saw Him*, by, reviewed, 25–46.
Jamnia, Academy of, founded by Johanan ben Zakkai, 200; becomes centre of Jewish life, 200; Rabban Gamaliel II, president of, 200; Eleazar ben Azariah, president of, 201.
Jargon, lectures and sermons in, 129.
Jehiel ben Asher, and the office of *Hazzan*, 9.
Jehoshua ben Chananiah. *See* Joshua ben Hananiah.
Jehuda ben Ezekiel, founder of School of Pumbeditha, alluded to, 217.
Jehuda ben Ilai, disciple of Akiba, alluded to, 202.
Jellinek, alluded to, 139.
Jeremiah, Palestinian Amora, alluded to, 218.
Jeremiah, the Book of, alluded to, 5, 109; quoted by Geiger against idea of Holy Land as Land of Promise, 64.
Jerusalem, alluded to, 27, 32–3, 39, 40, 43, 63, 65, 171, 174, 175, 181, 184; as symbol, not as place to be restored, 63; authority of Sanhedrin of, 171.
Jerusalem Talmud, quoted, 172, 176, 218, 219, 242–3; on gifts, 175; introduction to, by Frankel, alluded to, 181; Maimonides on Johanan as compiler of, 223; absence of tradition on completion

of, 224; reasons for copiousness of haggadic literature in, 224.
See also Talmud.
Jesus, as hero, 25; as God, 25; accepted by pagans for theological purposes. 25; divinity questioned, 25, 26; difficulties for writing adequate biography of, 26; Renan's and Martineau's "Lives" of, 26; varieties of national types of, 26–7; Gospels inadequate source for "Life" of, 25–6; adherents of, 27; the Pharisees and, 28; accuses Pharisees of hypocrisy, 29; and the money-changers, 32; miraculous cures of, 36–7; avowed himself Messiah, 38, 40; Messianic claims never realized, 38; entry into Jerusalem, 43; destruction of Jerusalem due to sin against, 43. controversy with Pharisees, 43. greeted by Johanan ben Zakkai. 41; as incarnation of Israel, 46; as "sweet Rabbi of Nazareth," 82; as prophet, 82; as subject for Jewish sermons, 82; glorification of, 165; Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus*, discussed, 163. 193; Edersheim, on divergence of Christian and Rabbinical teachings, 164; importance of opinions of Rabbis contemporary with, 167–8.
Jesus ben Abbas, alluded to, 39.
Jesus ben Sirach, alluded to, 123.
See also Wisdom of Ben Sira.
Job, the Book of, Midrash to, 125; Talmudic discussion on, 220.
Johanan ben Nappaha, of Sepphoris and Tiberias, Palestinian Amora, 217; compiler of Jerusalem Talmud, according to Maimonides, 221.
Johanan be Zakkai, alluded to, 182, 200; leader of peace party against Rome, 200; founded Academy of Jamnia, 200–1; disciples of, 201; quoted, 242; on Israel as slave of God, 243–4.
"John, the Gospel of," alluded to, 25.
Jonah, Palestinian Amora, 218.
Jonah, the Book of, Midrash to, 125.
Jonah, the Prophet, alluded to, 20.
Jonathan, disciple of R. Ishmael, alluded to, 202.
Jose, Palestinian Amora, alluded to, 218.
Jose, the Priest, alluded to, 182.
Jose of Galilee, Tanna, alluded to, 201; on the Sabbath, 212.
Jose ben Joezer, of Zereda, one of Zugot, alluded to, 197; halakot attributed to, 198.
Jose ben Johanan, of Jerusalem, alluded to, 197.
Jose of Pumbeditha, a Sabora, alluded to, 222.
Joseph, "Sinai," Babylonian Amora, authority on Targum, 184, 218.
Joseph ben Halafta, disciple of Akiba, alluded to, 203.
Joseph Bekor Shor, medieval Bible exegete, alluded to, 12.
Joseph Caro, alluded to, 1, 12.
Joseph Da Costa, work on etiquette, 95.
Josephus, alluded to, 123, 124, 197.
Joshua ben Hananiah, Tanna, alluded to, 180–81, 201.
Joshua ben Levi, Palestinian Amora alluded to, 217.
"Joshua ben Levi, the Story of", haggadic work, alluded to, 123.
Joshua ben Perahiah, alluded to, 197.
Josia, disciple of R. Ishmael, alluded to, 202.
Josippon, alluded to, 86, 123: authorship of, 137.
Jost, Jewish historian, alluded to, 86–7, 101.
"Jubilee Books," multiplicity of, 47–9.
Judah ben Asher, declines remuneration for rabbinical service, 15.
Judah Brieli, medieval rabbi, alluded to, 275.

Judah he-Hasid, author of "Book of Saints," quoted, 19–20.

Judah ben Jehiel, will of, quoted, 14–5; declines remuneration for rabbinical service, 15–6.

Judah ha-Levi, love of, for Zion, considered morbid by Geiger, 64; on "Fear, Love and Joy", as religious emotions, 264–5.

Judah ha-Nasi, called *Rabbenu ha-Kadosh*, the Patriarch, or simply Rabbi, on emigration from Babylon to Palestine, 64; alluded to 120, 176, 203; president of the Sanhedrin, 203; his relations with Roman authorities of Palestine, 203; mastery of Oral Law, 203–4; great authority of, renders possible compilation of Mishnah, 204; purpose of compilation, 205; Mishnah compilations utilized by him, 206; Mishnah of, becomes text-book of Oral Law because of authority of, 208–9; question whether he actually wrote down the Mishnah, debatable, 207; disciples of, 209, 217.

Judah ben Simon, on relation of rich to poor, 248; on virtue of aiding poor, 248.

Judah ben Tabbai, one of the *Zugot*, alluded to, 197.

Judaism, and mysticism, 18–20: Zunz's view of, 69, 110; Geiger's view of, 75; exaggerated tendencies in, 91; Zunz on, as private possession of Parnasim, 116, and asceticism, 263–4.

Judenthum, Das, und seine Geschichte, by Geiger, discussed, 57.

Judges, the Book of, cited, 216.

Judith, the Book of, alluded to, 123.

Jus talionis implied in Midrashic interpretation of passages in Exodus and Leviticus, 213.

Kabbalah, alluded to, 127, 129; defined, 194.

Kahana II, of Pumpeditha, credited with beginning compilation of Babylonian Talmud, 218.

Kal va-Homer, "a fortiori", one of hermeneutical rules of Hillel, 212.

Kalir, alluded to, 1, 8; 127–8; 134, 138.

Karaites, Zunz's aversion to, 111; alluded to, 128.

Kaufmann, David, quoted, 84.

Kedushah, elements of, defined, 251.

Kelim, "Vessels," tractate, described, 232.

Keritot, "Excisions," tractate, alluded to, 220; described, 231.

Ketab Galhut, letters and language of clerics, Jewish designation for Latin, 2.

Ketubot, "Marriage Deeds and Marriage Settlements," tractate, described, 229.

Kiddushin, "Betrothals," tractate, cited, 177–8; described, 229.

Kil'ayim, "Mixtures," tractate, described, 226.

Kindness to poor viewed by pagans as sin, 250.

Kingdom of Heaven, Rabbinical conception of, 184–5.

Kings, the Book of, cited, 214.

Kinim, "Nests" of birds, tractate, described, 232.

Kinyan Torah, haggadic fragment, alluded to, 123.

Kirschheim, alluded to, 210.

Kiyyum ha-'Olam, Talmudic term for perpetuation of the world, 271.

Kodashim, "Sacred things", the Order of, eleven tractates of, described, 230–1.

Kohen Hediot, ordinary priest, 180.

Kohn, S., alluded to, 130.

Kovno, alluded to, 4–5.

Krochmal, Nachman, contrasted with Geiger, 72; alluded to, 84, 104, 157.

Kusari, of Judah ha-Levi, quoted, 264–5.
Kutim, "Samaritans," minor tractate, referred to, 211.

Labor, as duty, 250; position of, in Judaism, 269–73; as a religious institution, 271; causes sin to be forgiven, 271; disdain of work and Jewish leaders, 272.
Lagarde, Paul de, alluded to, 160.
Landau, alluded to, 113–4.
Landauer, alluded to, 139.
Latin and Greek words interspersed in Mishnah, 205.
Law, study of, and pious works, 176.
Laws, the repeal of, divine and rabbinical, 172–3.
Lay-heads of Jewish community, power of, 92.
Laziness incompatible with religious life, 266.
Lecturing, system of, in antiquity and in Rabbinic ages, chapters in *G. V.*, analyzed, 126–9.
Legends as irresponsible history, 3.
Leon, Jacob Juda, portrait of, alluded to, 96.
Levi, Rabbi, Tanna, alluded to, 154.
Levi ben Gershon, philosophical works of, orthodoxy questioned, 89.
Levi ha-Sadar, Tanna, alluded to, 212.
Levitical purity, halakot dealing with, attributed to Jose ben Joezer, 198.
Leviticus, the Book of, instances of Midrashic interpretation of, 174, 205, 213–5; 228–9; 230–33; 243; *Sifra*, Midrash on, 211.
"Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah", by Edersheim, discussed, 163–93.
Literature, Jewish, wide scope of, 94–5.
Literaturgeschichte der Synagogalen Poesie, by Zunz, reviewed, 106–7; scope of, 107; greatest authority on subject, 107; Gestetner's index to, 107.
Liturgy, considered as bad paraphrase of Psalms, 98; as highest expression of Jewish sentiment, 185; as expression of feeling of Jews toward Gentiles, 185; Zunz's works on, listed, 105.
See also Prayer Book.
Livingston, explorer, alluded to, 80.
"Lord," as traditional title of Messiah, 43–4.
Low, Immanuel, essay on Geiger as philologist, 49.
Lud, conference at, alluded to, 179.
"Luke, the Gospel of", cited, 44.
Luzzatto, Moses Hayyim, unmarried state of, provokes displeasure of sages, 275.
Luzzatto, S. D., alluded to, 4, 11, 113, 138.
Lydda, School in, alluded to, 201.

Maaseh Bereshit, mystic work, 124.
Ma'aser Sheni, "Second Tithe," tractate, described, 226.
Ma'aserot, "Tithes," tractate, described, 226.
Macaulay, alluded to, 181.
Maccabean period, reading of Torah customary in, 118; alluded to, 191.
Maccabees, the Books of, alluded to, 123; the Second Book of the, alluded to, 124.
Mahzor, the German, contains many hymns by Palestinian authors, 8; large number of commentaries of, in Germany, 9; filled with compositions of German Saints, 10.
Maimonides, alluded to, 4, 11, 14, 95, 100, 111, 126, 128; quoted, 63; philosophical works, of orthodoxy suspected, 89; views on salaried scholars and teachers, 97; on R. Johanan as compiler of Jerusalem Talmud, 223.
Makkot, "Stripes," tractate, described, 229–30.

Makom, the Omnipresent, on giving praise to, 221.
Makshirin, "Preparers," tractate, described, 233.
Mandaic and the language of the Babylonian Talmud, 219.
Manners. *See Masseket Derek Erez: Tractado de Cortesia.*
Manual labor exalted as a virtue, 206.
Mar bar R. Ashi, Babylonian Amora, 218.
Marriage as a divine institution, 273; as vital obligation, 275.
Martineau, author of *Ecce Homo*, alluded to, 26; "three critical rules of", 28–9.
Martyrdom of Jews of Xanten, 9; of German Jews, 14–5, 17.
"Martyrs, the Ten, Execution of", haggadic fragment, 123.
Masseket Abot, haggadic fragment, alluded to, 122.
Masseket Derek Erez, minor tractate, alluded to, 210.
Masseket Kallah, minor tractate, alluded to, 210.
Masseket Middot, haggadic fragment, alluded to, 122.
Masseket Semahot, minor tractate, alluded to, 210.
Masseket Soferim, minor tractate, alluded to, 210.
Massiktot, the tractates of the six Orders of the Mishnah, 204.
"Master," *Rabban*, title of early Tannaim, 200.
"Matthew, the Gospel of", quoted, 39, 41, 43.
Meassefim, School of, alluded to, 86.
"Meditations of the Essenes", midrashic work, 124.
Meekness and humility, features of saintliness, 12–3.
Megilla Jerushalmi, cited, 181.
Megillah, "Roll" of Esther, tractate, quoted, 208; described, 228.
Megillat Antiochus, haggadic work, 123.
Megillat Hassidim, haggadic work, alluded to, 123.
Megillat Sammanim, tractate, alluded to, 208.
Megillat Setarim, haggadic work, alluded to, 123.
Megillat Ta'anit, referred to, 208.
Megillat Yuhasin, haggadic work, 123.
Mehlsag. *See* Samiler.
Meil Zedakah by Elijah Cohen, work on philanthropy, alluded to, 240.
Me'ilah, "Trespass," tractate, described, 219–20; 231.
Meir, disciple of Akiba, alluded to, 122–3, 203; Mishnah collection of, ground work of Mishnah compiled by Judah ha-Nasi, 202, 206.
"Meir, the Torah of", haggadic work, 124.
Meir ben Isaac, teacher of Rashi, alluded to, 10.
Meir of Rothenburg, modesty of, 13; incarceration of, 14–5.
Meir Schiff, German Talmudist, alluded to, 24.
Mekilta, "Measure," a portion of Midrash on Exodus, 120; 122, 211–15.
"Men of the Great Assembly (or Synagogue)", alluded to, 119–20; 196.
Menahot, "Meal-Offerings," tractate, described, 231.
Mendelssohn, Moses, alluded to, 68, 90, 95, 98, 111, 129.
Meor 'Enayim by Azariah de Rossi, alluded to, 88.
Merkabah, Baraita of, 124.
Merodach Baladan, prince of Babylonia, alluded to, 186.
"Messenger of the Congregation' *See Hazzan.*
Messiah, the, belief in, of German Jews, 7; how recognized, 35; Jesus and, 38–40; 43–4; "Lord" as title of, 43; allusions to, in Rabbinical literature, 44; opposed by Geiger,

62–3; 65; anticipation of coming of, discussed, 76–7; Zunz's view of, 80.
Meturgeman, the, 127.
Metz, community of, mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela, 6.
Mezuzah, minor tractate, referred to, 210.
Middot, "Measurements" of the Temple, tractate, alluded to, 33; described, 232.
Middot, Forty-nine, Baraita of, haggadic fragment, alluded to, 122.
Midrash, considered perversion of Pentateuch and Prophets, 98; chapter on, in *G. V.*, analyzed, 119–21; two kinds of, *Midrash Halakah* and *Midrash Haggadah*, 120–1; haggadic fragments in, 122; defined, 194; development of, by *Bet Hillel*, 200; exegetical basis of, 211; practical object of, 211; deduction of new Halakot from Scripture, 211; reveals interpretatory work of Tannaim, 211; example of vivid style of, 212–3; difficult to determine precedence of Halakah and, 212; supports old Halakot, 213.
See also Mekilta; *Sifra*; *Sifre*.
Midrash, Abkir, 125; *Abba Gorion*, 125; *Blessing of Jacob, the*, 125; *Chronicles*, 125; *Debarim Rabbah*, 125; *Debarim Zuta*, 125; *Ekah Rabbati*, 124; *Eleh Ezkerah*, 123; *Esfa*, 125; *Esther*, 125; *Ezra*, 125; *Hashkem*, 125; *Huppat Eliyyahu*, 125; *Isaiah*, 125; *Job*, 125; *Jonah*, 125; *Haftarot*, 125; *Konen*, 124; *Ma'aseh Torah*, 125; to *Proverbs*, 125; on *Psalms*, 125; to *Samuel*, 125; *Shemini Othothav*, 125; *Shemot Rabbah*, *Shir ha-Shirim*, 125, 223; *Ta'ame Haserot Wiyeterot; Tadshe* 125; *Temurah*, 123; on the *Ten Commandments*, 123; on *"the Three Things"*, 125; *Wayekullu*, 127; *R. Meir*, 200.
Midrash, Exegetical, first germs found in Hosea, Ezekiel, etc., and Pentateuch, 109.
Midrash Haggadah, defined, 120.
Midrash Halakah, treated in Zunz *G. V.*, 10; defined, 120.
Midrash Rabbah, haggadic work, 122.
Midrashim to Pentateuch and Biblical Books, chapters on, in *G. V.*, analyzed, 125.
Midrashim as perversion of Pentateuch. attributed to Ishmael ben Elisha, 199.
Midrashim on Death of Moses and Aaron, 123.
Mikwaot, "Wells," tractate, described, 232.
Mill, John Stuart, quoted, 49.
Minhagim, customs, 193.
Minor tractates, referred to, 123, 210.
Miracles, frequency of, in time of Jesus, 36–7; tendency to minimize number, by modern students, 37.
Mishnah, as product of Jewish belief, 104; collections of earlier, employed by compiler, 107; as depository of Oral Law, defined and described, 143, 204–5; date of compilation, 143, 205; idiom of, 204–5; the division into Six Orders, 204; purpose of compilation, 205; examples of earliest strata discernible, 206–7; question whether compiler actually wrote down, debatable; as text-book of students of the Oral Law, 209.
See Baraita; Judah ha-Nasi: *Tosefta*: *Mishnah ha-Hizonah*.
Mishnah ha-Hizonah, the *Baraita* or "the external Mishnah," 209.
Mishnayyot, alluded to, 120.
Mishne Torah, by Maimonides, alluded to, 11.
Mission doctrine of Israel, as conceived by Geiger, 54, 65.
Missionaries, Christian, zeal of, 74.

Modernity and need of past, 41.
Modesty of Ashkenazic commentators, 10.
Mo'ed, "Season," the order of, the twelve tractates of, described, 227–8.
Mo'ed Katon, "Minor Feast," tractate, described, 228.
Mohammedanism, Israel greater than, 45.
Money-changers in Temple, 32–3.
Moral precepts, compiled by saints.
"Moses, the Chronicle of", haggadic work, 123.
"Moses, the Chronicle of", haggadic work, 123, 189.
Moses ben Eliezer ha-Kohen, author of "Book of Saints," quoted, 19–21.
Moses ha-Cohen, of Xanten, martyrdom of, 7–8.
"Moses, Midrash on Death of", 123.
"Moses, Laws unto, from Mount Sinai", alluded to, 196.
Moses ha-Darshan, chapter on, in *G. V.*, 126.
Mount of Olives, alluded to, 32, 65.
"Mountain-Mover," name applied to Rabban ben Nahmani, 218.
Muenster, community of, mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela, 6.
Mystical tendencies of Akiba's disciples, 202.
Mystical writers, Isaiah and Ezekiel as, 109.
Mysticism, Judaism and, 18–20; chapter on, in *G. V.*, analyzed, 124.
See also Kabbala: Sod.

Nachgelassene Schriften, by Geiger, alluded to, 33, 58, 62, 67–8.
Nahman, Rabbi, on celibacy, 268.
Nahmanides, pilgrimage of, to Palestine, 65.
Nares, School in, founded by R. Papa, 218.
Nashim, "Women," the Order of, the seven tractates of, described, 228–9.
Nasi, "Prince" or "President", of Sanhedrin, 117, 197.
Nathan ha-Babli, Tanna, alluded to, 203.
Nathan of Braslav, on truth, 74–5.
Nathan of Cordova, alluded to, 97.
"Nathan of the Light", alluded to, 35.
Nationalism, Jewish, considered, 78–9; and anti-Semitism, 77.
Nazir, "Nazirite," tractate, described, 219–20; 229.
Nedarim, "Vows," tractate, described, 219–20; 229.
Nehardea, School in, mentioned, 217.
Nega'im, "Leprosy," tractate, described, 232.
Nehemiah, the Book of, alluded to, 119.
Nehemiah, Tanna, disciple of Akiba, alluded to, 202: compiler of a *Tosefta*, 209–10.
Netherlands, alluded to, 120.
Neubauer, alluded to, 16, 130.
Neumann, Dr. S., alluded to, 141.
New Hebrew, idiom of Mishnah, 204–5; 209.
Newman, Cardinal, alluded to, 75.
New Testament and Rabbinical writings, Edersheim on divergence of, 164–5; alluded to, 123–5; 195, 197.
See also Gospels.
New Year's prayer, quoted, 185.
Nezikin, "Damages," the Order of, the ten tractates of, described, 229–30.
Niddah, the "Menstruous," tractate, described, 232.
Nineveh, alluded to, 20.
Nissim, R., haggadic collection of, alluded to, 123.
Nittai of Arbela, alluded to, 197.
Nitsah, the House of, on importance of study, 175–8.
Nizrak, Hebrew and Yiddish term for humble and dependent poor, 261.
Nokri, term defined, 186.

Novels, theological, embodied in "Lives of Jesus," 25.
Numbers, the Book of, cited, 205, 210, 216, 226–9; 231–2; *Sifre* and *Sifre Zuta* on, 211.

Oholot, "Tents," tractate, described, 232.
Olam ha-Ba, "salvation," loss of, and the truth, 74.
Onkelos, Targum of, alluded to, 121.
Old Testament. *See* Bible, the.
Oral Law, the, defined, 194; the "Pairs' in relation to development of, 197; and Written Law, subject to historical modifications, 104; supposed, and living stream of divine tradition, 167; basis for enactments of, in Scripture, found by Akiba, 202; prohibition against writing down contents of, 207–8; Mishnah chief depository of, 204–5; presupposes knowledge of institutions established by, 205; authority of Mishnah compilation of Judah ha-Nasi over others, 208-9.
Orders, the Six, of the Mishnah, tractates of, described, 202, 204, 226–33.
Ordinances, the repeal of, authority of Rabbis in, 174–5.
'Orlah, "Uncircumcised," tractate, described, 227.
Orobio, Isaac, portrait of, alluded to, 96.
Orphan and widow, the, pagan neglect of, 224.
Orthodox Judaism and religious observance, 74.
"Other," *Aher*, discussed, 44–5.

Pagan conception of charity, 249–51.
"Pairs," *See Zugot*.
Paitanim. *See* Piyyutim.
Palestine, restoration of, hoped for, 63; considered "romantic" by Geiger, 64; Geiger on, as Promised Land, 64; view of Rab Judah on emigration from Babylon to, 68, 73; alluded to, 129; literature of, 224–5.
Palestinian Amoraim, list of important, literature produced by, 216–8; Rabbi, title of, 216.
Palestinian Talmud, "the Talmud of Jerusalem," "the Talmud of the Land of Israel," "the Talmud (or the Gemara) of the West" alluded to, 218; dialect of, 219; concise style of, 219.
Palquera, Shemtob, Zunz's essay on, alluded to, 87.
Papa, Babylonian Amora, founder of School in Nares, 218.
Parable, of "Good Samaritan," and "Good Israelite," 94; illustrating pagan and Jewish conceptions of charity, 249–50.
Parah, "Red Heifer," tractate, described, 232.
Parnasim, power of, 92–3; attacked by Zunz, 94, 104.
Paul, Apostle, alluded to, 31, 200.
Pea, "Corner," tractate, described, 226.
Penitent, the true, position of, 190.
Pentateuch, the, the Talmud as perversion of; contains germs of exegetical Midrash, 109; weekly Readings from, 118; legal part of, requires interpretation, 119; does not form part of tradition, 120; germs of exegetical haggadah in, 109, 124; Midrashim on, 125.
Perakim, sections of tractates of Mishnah, 204.
Perek ha-Shalom, minor tractate, alluded to, 123.
Persecutions of Jews, by Crusaders, 16.
Persia, alluded to, 129.
Pesahim, "Passovers," tractate, cited, 199; described, 227.
Peshat, simple understanding of Scriptures, 121; instances of, as used in *Midrash*, 214.

Pesikta, the, (*de-Rab Kahana*), chapters on, in *G. V.*, analyzed, 124; homilies based on Haftarot, 225.
Pesikta Rabbati, chapter on, in *G. V.*, analyzed, 125.
Peter, the Apostle, alluded to, 18.
Pharisaism, Israel greater than, 45; on sin, 190.
Pharisees, as viewed by Renan and Martineau, 27–8; as viewed in "As Others Saw Him," 28, 29, 31; "Woes" against, by Jesus, 25; on sin and repentance, 190–1.
Pharisees and Sadducees, struggle between, 120; alluded to, 190, 191; controversial Halakah cited on relation between, 213.
Philanthropy, Halakic literature contains laws about charity, but no history, 237; Jewish view of, 239; no real book on subject, 240; *Meil Zedakah* by R. Elijah Cohen, only book on, 240–1; underlying principles of charity, 241; all wealth belongs to God; 241–2; men belong to God, 243–4; relation between rich and poor, 244-5; treatment of poor, 245–7; God and men, with relation to poor, 247–9; pagan conception of charity, 249–51; Jewish attitude towards suffering and poverty, 251–3; poor held in high esteem, 253–56; Israel and poverty, 256, 259; two aspects of poverty, 258; poverty the greatest hardship, 259–61; poverty as a degenerating force, 261–3; Judaism and hedonism, 263, 267; Judaism and asceticism, 267–9; position of work in Judaism, 269–73; prohibition of celibacy, 273, 275; the family and charity, 275–6.
Philippson, Ludwig, alluded to, 130.
Philo, alluded to, 124.
Philosophy, no systems of, in Talmud, 159.
Pilgrimages to Palestine, 65.
Pilpulistic lecture, alluded to, 129.
Pinsker, alluded to, 111.
Pirke Abot, quoted, on asceticism, 264; on marriage, 268.
See also, Abot.
Piyyutim, by German saints not incorporated in *Siddur*, 10; *Gematriot* as means of ascertaining anonymous authors of, 102; as continuation of spirit of Psalms, 109–10; chapter on, in *G. V.*, 127–8.
Plato, alluded to, 70, 100.
Poetry, secular, and Zunz, 112.
Poland, migration of German Jews into, 23; saints of, 73; alluded to, 129.
Poor, the, on aiding, instead of buying Scroll of Law, 19; and rich alike, 244; treatment of, 245–46; consideration for feeling of, 246; God and men with relation to, 247; regarded by pagans as slaves, under curse of gods, 250; Hebrew terms *ani* and *anaw* discussed, 252; high regard for, 253; close relation to God, 253; God's people, 254; God feels responsibility for causing one to be poor, 256; as title of honor of Israel, 256.
See also Charity; Philanthropy; Poverty.
Poor scholars inferior to wealthy scholars, 263.
Portraits of Jewish celebrities, lack of, 96.
Poverty, not a vice or crime, 242; a meritorious quality, necessary for spiritual welfare, 256–7; imparts beauty of character to Israel, 257; stimulant to repentance, 257; not raised to religious system, 257; the greatest hardship, 259; as moral test, 259; cause of loss of independence, 259; degradations due to, 261; Ben Sira on, 261; as a degenerating force, 261–63; pro-

duces Godlessness, 262; cause of untruthfullness, 262–63; not desirable end in itself, 263.

Poznanski, essay on Geiger, 50.

Prague, Zunz as preacher in, 113.

Prayer, defined, 7; value of, to saints, 7; sacred devotion during prayer, 22.

Prayer-book, the affinity of German and Palestinian rituals, 7; Sephardic, order of prayer borrowed from Babylonian schools, 7; German Jews' love of, 8; sacred regard for, 8; quality of Ashkenazic and Sephardic hymns compared, 11.

Precepts of saints, quoted, 17, 23.

Prejudices of medieval German Jews, 3.

Promised Land. *See* Holy Land.

Prophetic Judaism and Geiger, 73.

Prophetical Readings. *See* Haftarot.

Prophecy, the shining light of, 35.

Prophets, the, the Books of Talmud and Midrash considered perversion of 98; Prophecy does not cease with, 110; germs of exegetical haggadah in, 124.

Proselytes to Judaism through intermarriage, 79.

Protestantism, Jewish and Orthodox rabbis and, 74.

Proverbs, the Book of, cited, 5, 183, 216; Midrash to, 125.

Psalmist, dependence upon God, 72–3.

Psalmists did not cease with Maccabees, 110.

Psalms, the Book of, interpretation of, as alluding to Messiah, 43–4; cited, 72, 74, 98, 207, 216, 221, 241; Midrash to, 125.

Psalms, sentiment of, revived in liturgy, 110.

Pseudo-Jonathan, Targum on the Pentateuch, 121.

Pumbeditha, School of, founded by R. Jehuda ben Ezekiel, 217.

Rab, disciples of, 217; quotations attributed to, 216.

Rab, title of, of Babylonian teachers 216.

Raba, Babylonian Amora, 218.

Rabbah ben Nahmani, Babylonian Amora, "the Mountain Mover", 218.

Rabbah Tasfaah, of Pumbeditha, Babylonian Amora, 218; helped complete and reduce to writing Babylonian Talmud, 218.

Rabbanan Saburai. *See* Saborai.

Rabban, "Master," title of Tannaim 42, 120.

Rabbenu ha-Kadosh, name given to Judah ha-Nasi, 203.

Rabbi, "my Master," title of Tannaim, 42, 120, 200.

Rabbina (Rab Abina), of Sura, Babylonian Amora, 218; helped complete and reduce to writing Babylonian Talmud, 218.

Rabbinical Conference, Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1846, referred to, 75–6.

Rabbinical Ordinances, authority and duration of, 172–3.

Rabbis, real merits of, recognized by Zunz, 100; Edersheim, on vainglory of, 169; attitude of, towards Gentiles, 183–4; as mortals, 193.

Rabiah, by Samiler, alluded to, 102.

Rahamim, defined, 5–6.

Ramsgate, Judith College at, alluded to, 136.

Rapoport, alluded to, 4, 57, 139, 161; correspondence with Zunz, 101, 113.

Rashi, alluded to, 5, 10, 175; modesty of, 13; commentary of, to the Talmud, alluded to, 12; essay on, by Zunz, 89, 100, 136.

Rationalism, need for scientific basis of, 90; superficial, 91; and the holy life, 72.

Rationalists and saints, 3–4.

Ratzinger, author of book on charity from Catholic point of view, 239.
Rav, on the dignity of labor, 260.
Raziel, the Book of, alluded to, 124.
Redeemer. *See* Messiah.
Reform Judaism considered, 79.
Reform movement and life of religionist, 72.
Regensburg, alluded to, 6.
Reggio, alluded to, 132.
Rejoicing of the Law. *See Simhat Torah.*
Religion of humanity, and Judaism, 62.
"Remnant of the Men of the Great Assembly," alluded to, 196.
Renan, Ernest, *Vie de Jesus*, by, alluded to, 26; on defects of Jewish race, 28; admiration for Francis of Assisi, 75.
Repeal of Ordinances, the, divine and Rabbinical, 172–6.
Repentance, Jew's duty to urge Gentile toward, 20; discussed, 188–9.
Responsa as records of Jewish charitable work, 240.
Reuchlin, alluded to, 161.
Rhine, Jewish communities of, mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela, 6–7; correspondence of leaders of, with Palestinian authorities, 8.
Rich and poor, relation between, 244–5.
Ritus des Synagogalen Gottesdienstes, brief analysis of contents of Zunz's 133–4.
Rohling, alluded to, 183.
Roke'ah, legalist work of Eliezer ben Jehudah, of Worms, alluded to, 22.
Romans, degenerate qualities of, alluded to, 3; wars against, and Johanan ben Zakkai, 200.
Rosh ha-Shanah, "New Year", tractate, described, 228.
Rules of Interpretation, the Seven, framed by Hillel, 199; the Thirteen, framed by Ishmael ben Elisha, 201: Thirty-two, of Eliezer-hen Jose, 122, 211.
Rufus and Rabbi Akiba, discussion on charity, between, 249–50.
Russia, Jews of, and Zaddikim-cult, 47; influence of rabbis of, 92.

Saadya, Gaon, acquainted with original of Ben Sira, 208.
Sabbath, the, Geiger and preservation of, 81; reading of the Law on, 118; view of Shammai on, 199; earliest Mishnaic references on, 206; discussion in Midrash regarding, 212; and poverty, 260.
Sabbatical year, discussion, regarding, in Midrash, 213.
Saborai, group of Talmudic authorities, 222–3; activities of, 121, 223; peculiar to Babylon, 223.
Sacrifices, high cost of, resented by Samuel ben-Gamaliel, 33–4; order of, in Temple, 40, and the Sabbath, 199; of first fruits in Temple, 206–7.
Sadducees, Geiger on origin of, 50; struggle between Pharisees and, 127; controversial Halakah on Pharisees and, 213.
Sadduceism, Israel greater than, 45.
Safed, referred to, 248.
Saint, defined, 4, 17.
Saintliness, characteristics of, 9, 12–4; 17, and holiness, 22.
Saints, Polish Jewish, and holiness, 73.
Saints, Jewish, religious devotion of, 5, in medieval Germany, 5–18.
Salfeld, S , author of works on martyrolo gies, alluded to, 16.
Salman, fourteenth century rabbi, on honest dealing, 21.
Salvation, loss of and the truth, 74–5.
Samaritan, the Good, parable of, and the Good Israelite, 44; term defined, 186.
Samaritans and Jews, enmity between, 185–6.
Samiler, reviews Zunz's *G. V.*, 102; sarcastic parodies by, on *Gematriot*, 102.
Samson, alluded to, 216.
"Samsonsche Freischule, Die," 85.

Samuel, the Book of, cited, 189.
"Samuel and Adda, the Baraita of," 122.
Samuel the Astronomer, Babylonian Amora, 217.
Samuel, Mar, Babylonian Amora, alluded to, 137.
Samuel ben Gamaliel, resents high cost of sacrifices, 33–4.
Samuel he-Hasid, alluded to, 19.
Samuel ben Jose ben R. Bun, Palestinian Amora, cited, 218.
Samuel ben Meir, medieval Bible exegete, alluded to, 12.
Samuel ben Nahmani, Palestinian haggadist, 217.
Sanctification and saintliness, 215.
Sanhedrin, tractate, alluded to, 180–1, 186, 190–1; described, 229–30.
Sanhedrin, the, replace prophets in line of tradition, 119–20; the *Zugot* or "Pairs" as heads of, 120, 197; authority of, 171; repeal of decisions of, 173; migratory body in time of Judah ha-Nasi, 203; transactions of, recorded in Mishnah, 207.
Satan, alluded to, 37.
"Sayings of the Jewish Fathers." *See 'Abot.*
Schools, *Beth Midrash*, institution of, 120.
Scribes, the, authority of words of, 171; respect for, 180; verbal subtlety of, 181; and Evangelists contrasted, 189.
Scriptures. *See* Bible, the.
"Sea of the Talmud", designation for contents of Talmud, 149, 222.
"Secret of Creation, the," mystic work, 124.
Seder Eliyyahu, haggadic fragment, alluded to, 122.
Seder 'Olam, attributed to Jose ben, Halafta, 122, 203.
Seder 'Olam Zuta, haggadic work, 123.
Sefer Hasidim, "Book of the Saints," quoted, 19–21.
Sefer Torah, minor tractate, referred to, 210.
Sefer ha-Yashar, alluded to, 123–4.
Sefer Yezirah, alluded to, 124.
Selihah, the, spirit of Psalms revived in, 110; alluded to, 112.
Sephard, term explained, 2; identified with Jewry under Mohammedan rule, 2; benefit from Arabic culture, 2.
Sephard, Jews of, contrasted with Ashkenaz Jews, 2.
Sepphoris, seat of Sanhedrin during persecutions, 203.
Septuagint, quoted, 214.
Sermons, quotation from Zunz's, 113; early need of, to interpret Bible, 119.
Servants, admonition on, gentle treatment of, 19.
Shabbat, "Sabbath," tractate, quoted, 199, 206; described, 227.
Shammai, one of the *Zugot*, alluded to, 197; quoted, 199; interpretation of the Law, 199.
See also Hillel.
Shammai, the School of, alluded to, 126; (*Bet Shammai*), 168, 198; conservative adherents of tradition, 200; views of, recorded as minority opinion on Mishnah, 205–6; Mishnah collections of, utilized by Judah ha-Nasi, 206.
Shebi'it, "Sabbatical Year," tractate, described, 226.
Shebu'ot, "Oaths," tractate, described, 230.
Sheeltot of Geonim, alluded to, 121; of Rab Aha, 122.
Shekalim, "Shekels," tractate, described, 227.
Shekinah, "Glory of God," alluded to, 35, 86, 215; "Divine Manifestation" laments at suffering of sinners, 191; caused to dwell upon Israel as result of work, 271.

Sheliah Zibbur, "Messenger of the Congregation." *See Hazzan.*
Shema', recited before martyrdom, 9; custom of daily reading of, in Mishnah, 205–6.
Shemaiah and Abtalyon, the "Great Ones of the Generation", alluded to, 197–8.
Shemot Rabbah, Midrashic work, 125.
Sheshet, Babylonian Amora, 217.
Shilhi, School of, founded by R. Sheshet, 217.
Shimeon ben Nathanael, alluded to, 182.
Shimeon. *See also* Simeon; Simon,
Shining Light of Prophecy, 35.
Shir ha-Shirim, Midrash on, 125, 223.
Shofar, blowing of, held in high regard by German saints, 10; unwillingness to officiate at, reproved by Jehiel ben Asher, 10–11.
Shulhan 'Aruk, alluded to, 1.
"Shulhan 'Aruk Jews", religious emotion of, 74.
Siddur. *See* Prayer Book.
Sifra, "the Book", Midrash on Leviticus; alluded to 120, 122, 211; quoted, 210, 213–5.
Sifre, "the Books", Midrash on Numbers and Deuteronomy, alluded to, 120, 122, 171, 172, 189, 211, 215–6.
Sifre Zuta, Midrash on Numbers, 120, 122.
Simeon ben 'Azzai, disciple of Akiba, alluded to, 202, 274.
Simeon ben Lakish, Palestinian Amora, 217.
Simeon ben Manasya, Tanna, on the Sabbath, 212.
Simeon ben Shetah, one of the *Zugot*, alluded to, 197; introduces several religious reforms, 198.
Simeon ben Yohai, Mekilta of, 137, 211.
Simeon ben Zoma, disciple of Akiba, alluded to, 202.
Simeon. *See* Shimeon; Simon.
Simhat Torah, first introduced in Babylon, 118.
Simlai, Palestinian Amora, 217.
Simon ha-Darshan, alluded to, 122.
Simon ben Gamaliel, resents high cost of sacrifices, 33; alluded to, 35.
Simon II ben Gamaliel II, disciple of Akiba, alluded to, 203.
Simon the Just, alluded to, 119.
Simon Kahira, author of *Halakot Gedolot*, alluded to, 121.
Simon ben Lakish, quoted, 217, 242, 257.
Simon ben Yohai, disciple of Akiba, Mekilta of, 137, 211; alluded to, 202–3; on neglect of study of Torah, 268–9; on importance of honest work, 269.
Simon. *See also* Shimeon, Simeon.
Simona, of Pumbeditha, a *Sabora*, 222–3.
Sin and repentance, views of Rabbis and Gospels, 188–9.
"Sinai," designation of R. Joseph, 218.
Smolensky, Perez, on disdain for manual labor, 266.
Sod, mystical explanation of Scripture, 121.
Sofer, Moses, quoted, 75; alluded to, 73; on allegiance to Torah, 60–1.
Soferim, haggadic fragment, 122.
Soferim, the, as carriers of voice of God, 109, 115; defined, 196; words of the, 196.
Solomon, King, alluded to, 207.
Solomon ben Isaac. *See* Rashi.
"Solomon, the Wisdom of", haggadic work, 123–4.
Song, love of, by Ashkenaz saints, 8–9.
Song of Songs, the Book of *Midrash*, on, 125, 223.
Sotah, "the Suspected Woman," tractate, described, 229.
Spain, alluded to, 8, 14, 127–8, 132; rabbinical authorities of, alluded to, 207.

Spinoza, alluded to, 96, 101, 111.
Stephen, Leslie, quoted, 58–9; alluded to, 75.
Stern, book on persecutions of Jews during the Crusades, alluded to, 16.
Stern, bibliography of Geiger by, alluded to, 48.
Stern, N. A., alluded to, 74.
Strauss, David Friedrich, influence of, on Geiger, 55.
Stubbs, Bishop, quoted, 67.
Study and good works, discussed, 175–6.
Suffering, Jewish attitude towards, 251–3; as a virtue, 252.
Sukkah, "Booth" or "Tabernacle," tractate, example of treatment of Scriptures, cited, 205; described 227.
Sura, School of, founded by Abba Arika, 217.
Symmachos, Tanna, authority on civil law, 203.
Synagogale Poesie, des Mittelalters, Die, by Zunz, alluded to, 105; analyzed, 134–5.
Synagogue, the institution of, as creation and creator of tradition, 108; sublimest expression of Israel's life, 112, 115, as institution of prayer and teaching, 115 118.
Synagogue, Reform in, by suppressing arrogance of rich, 94.
Synhedrion. *See* Sanhedrin.

Ta'anit, "Fast," tractate, cited, 154–5; described, 228.
Tabernacle, description of, *Baraita* on, 122; alluded to, 208.
Talmidim, "disciples", in line of tradition, 119.
Talmud, the, influence of, 86; strange literature, 86; as perversion of Pentateuch and Prophets, 98; Zunz's early prejudices against, 99; as product of Jewish belief, 110; main object to interpret Mishnah, 120, 219; study of, 143; progress in, 143–4; little philological study of Rabbinical classics, 143; importance of study of, 144; compared with studies of oriental literature, 144; difficulties besetting proper study of, 144–51; what is the Talmud?, 144; too varied for definite description, 144; its division in form and substance, 144; what it is not, 144–5; full of fragmentary notices on many subjects, 146; how edited and compiled, 147–8; record of religious food of rabbinical Judaism, 147; material collected by Rab Ashi, 148; when completed, 148–9; language of, 149; the *Yam ha-Talmud*, the "Sea of the Talmud," 149;, character of the text of, 150; corrupt and defective texts, 151; contraditions in, 151; tolerance and intolerance of Rabbis, 152; central aim of Talmudic authorities, 152; valued monographs on special phases of, 153; difficulties of, 151; nature of God in, 154; study of, approached with care, 154; theological fancy of the Rabbis, 154; impossible to construct theological or philosophical system on basis of speculations of, 154; no philosophy of, 155; lack of proper guides to study of, 156; scientific study of recent date, 156; important study of, by Spanish and Franco-German schools of middle ages, 156–7; profound be'ief prevents a scientific study of, 157; hatred of Gentile, 157; love of Gentile, 157; critical study of, in 19th century, by Rapoport, Krochmal, Frankel, Zunz, Geiger, 157–8; never systematically taught in universities like Latin and Greek Classics, 158; need of scientific apparatus for study of, 159; nonexistence of accurate text of,

160; exaggerated praise and abuse of, 161; quoted to meet special theories, 162; tendency to rummage in, for curios, 162; misinterpreted by Edersheim, 164; eschatology of, 184; exaggerated claims of contents, 192; permeated with religion and service of law and right, 192; plea for critical study of, 193; defined, 194; the Soferim, 196–7; the Zugot, 197–8; the Tannaim, 199–204; the Amoraim, 216–8; reduced to writing, 218; the Gemara, 219; difference between Mishnah and Gemara, 219; Aramaic dialect employed in, 219; style of, 219–22; similarities of diction, 219; example treatment of Mishnah, 220–1; tractates of, described, 225–33; bibliography of literature on, 234–7; editors of, 234; introductions to, 235; dictionaries and grammars of, 236–7; quoted, 242.

Talmud Yerushalmi. See Jerusalem Talmud.

Talmud Babli. See Babylonian Talmud.

Tamid, tractate, alluded to, 33.

Tana de-be Eliyyahu, minor tractate, 123.

Tana de-be R. Ishmael, haggadic fragment, 122.

Tarfon, Rabbi, Tanna, alluded to, 177–8, 201.

Takkanot, ordinances, defined, 195–7.

Tamid, "Continual sacrifice", tractate, described, 231.

Tannaim, the, interpretatory work of, revealed in Midrash, 124, 211; rabbinical authorities of first two centuries C. E., 199; Schools of Hillel and Shammai, first of, 199; R. Judah the Patriarch, last of, 199; title *Rabbi* or *Rabban* borne by, 200; list of distinguished, 200–4; acquainted with original of Ben Sira, 208.

Tarfon, Rabbi, on "study and good works," 177–8; alluded to, 201.

Targum, the, R. Joseph, authority on, 212.

Targum of Akiba, alluded to, 122.

Targum Jonathan, alluded to, 121.

Targum Onkelos, alluded to, 121.

Targum Yerushalmi, alluded to, 121.

Targumim, early introduction of, 118–9; chapters on, in *G. V.*, analyzed, 121–2, 124.

Taylor, Charles, alluded to, 169, 170–1, 182–3.

Tebul Yom, "Immersed During the Day", tractate, described, 233.

Tefillin, minor tractate, referred to, 211.

Temple of Jerusalem, the, money changers in, 32–43; organization and description of, 33; order of sacrifices at, 32–34; alluded to 40–42, 200, 206–7, 208; Jewish and Christian reasons for destruction of, 42–3; destruction of, embittered Rabbis of Talmud, 184; Eliezer ben Jacob I, authority on structure and service of, 202–3; gifts to, 242, 247.

Temurah, "Change," tractate, described, 219–20, 231; quoted, 208.

Terumot, "Heave-Offerings," tractate, described, 226.

Teuton, virile qualities of, alluded to, 3.

Theology of Rabbis, Edersheim on, 187–8.

Theosophic character of German Jewish mysticism, 18.

Thirty-two Rules of Rabbi Eliezer ben Jose of Galilee, 122, 211.

Tiberias, place where Sanhedrin convened during persecutions, 203.

Tiktin, Solomon, controversy with Abraham Geiger, 47, 49.

Tithes, discussed, 174–5.

Tobia ben Eliezer, medieval Talmudist, alluded to, 126.

Tobit, the Book of, alluded to, 123.

Tohorot, "Purifications," the Order of, the twelve tractates of, described, 232–3; tractate, described, 232.
Toledo, alluded to, 14.
Tombs, incriptions on, 142.
Torah, the, Israel wedded to, 5; regard for, by German saints, 15, 18–9; as balance between flesh and spirit, 19; Galilean dislike for, 41; as word of God, 59, 63; reading of, customary in Maccabean period, 118; knowledge and ideals of, zealously diffused by Sanhedrin, 120; the Books of the Bible as compliment to, 120; intended for man, 192; study of, combined with work, 270.
"Torah by Mouth." *See* Oral Law.
"Torah-in-Writing," Written Law, 194.
Torah of R. Meir, haggadic work, 124.
Torat Kohanim, "The Law of the Priests", Midrashic work, alluded to, 199, 211.
Tosfaah, Rabbah, of Pumpeditha. *See* Rabbah Tosfaah.
Tosafists, essay on, chapter in *Zur Geschichte*, 130.
Tosefta, "addition" to the Mishnah, R. Hiyya and R. Hoshaya Rabba, compilers of, 120, 167, 216–7; defined, 209; alluded to, 122; contains occasional comments from Gemara, 209.
Tosefta of R. Nehemiah, referred to, 209–10.
Tractado de Cortesia, by Joseph Da Costa, alluded to, 95.
Tractates of Talmud enumerated, 225–33.
See also Massiktot; Orders, the Six; *Perakim*.
Tradition, appeals to, 47; and Holy Writ, 176; as creation and creator of institution of Synagogue, 108; ancient custom against writing down contents of, 207–8; custom not applicable to haggadic books, 208.
"Traditions of the Old Sages", haggadic work, 124.
Treves, community of, mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela, 6.
Triennial Cycle, alluded to, 118.
Truth, precept on importance of speaking the, 27.
Tunis, alluded to, 129.
Tur Orah Hayyim, by Jacob ben Asher, cited, 1.
Turkey, migration to, of German Jews, 23–4; alluded to, 128.

Ukzin, "Stalks," tractate, described, 233.
Ula, Amora, alluded to, 174.
Ulhorn's *History of Christian Charity*, referred to, 239; contends Jewish charity inferior to Christian, 239–40.
Usha, School at, founded by Ishmael ben Elisha, 201; seat of Sanhedrin, 203.

Verein fuer Cultur und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, alluded to, 87; Zunz's activities in, 89; dissolution of, 91.
"*Vie de Jesus*," by Renan, alluded to, 26.
Vulgate, the, alluded to, 214.

"Wealth, All, belongs to God", an underlying Jewish principle, 241–3.
Wealth and authority, 92.
"Weekly Readings," from the Pentateuch, 118, 128.
Weiss, Isaac Hirsch, Austrian Talmudist, alluded to, 5, 104.
Wellhausen, alluded to, 37, 55.
"Welling-spring, A," characterization of Eleazar ben Arak, 182–3.
Wills. *See* Ethical Wills.

Wisdom of Ben Sira. *See* Ecclesiasticus.
"Wisdom of Solomon", haggadic work, alluded to, 123–4.
"Woes" against Pharisees, uttered by Jesus, 44.
Wolf, J. C., Christian Hebraist, alluded to, 88.
Wolfenbuttel, *Samsonische Freischule* at, 85; Gymnasium at, attended by Zunz, 87.
Work, diverts mind from sin, 270; obligation to, divine commandment, 270, 271; divine quality of, 270–1; creative attribute of the Deity, 271.
Worms, community of, mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela, 6.
See also Elijah ben Jehudah.

Xantin, Jews of, attacked by Crusaders, 9.

Yadayim, "Hands," tractate, described, 233.
Yannai, Palestinian Amora, alluded to, 216; on charity, 246.
Yannai, Palestinian payyetan, alluded to, 5.
Yebamot, "Levirate Marriages," tractate, cited, 180; described, 228.
Yehudai Gaon, alluded to, 121.
Yelammedenu, chapter on, in *G. V.*, analyzed, 125.
Yerushalumi, Horayot, Rosh ha-Shana, Shekalim, quoted, 170, 208, 216.
Yeshibot, Talmudical seminaries, alluded to, 90.
Yoma, "The Day," also *Yom ha-Kippurm*, "The Day of Atonement", tractate, alluded to, 180; described, 227.
Yosippon. See *Josippon*.

Zabim, "Persons afflicted with running issues", tractate, described, 233.
Zebahim, "Sacrifices," tractate, described, 228.
Zechariah, the Book of, alluded to, 39.
Zedakah and *Hesed*, sublime qualities, 251.
Zeraim, "Seeds," the Order of, eleven tractates of, described, 226–7.
Zerubbabel, the Book of, haggadic work, 123.
"Zion-Ode," the, of Judah ha-Levi, alluded to, 64.
Zionism and perpetuation of Jewish nation, 88.
Zisit, minor tractate, referred to, 210.
Zohar, alluded to, 100, 138.
Zugot, the, "Pairs" of leading Talmudic teachers, alluded to, 197.
Zunz, Adelheid, alluded to, 116; inscription on tomb of, 142.
Zunz, Leopold, (Yomtob Lipman), alluded to, 4, 70, 80, 83, 84, 89, 157; *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*, reviewed by Geiger, 70; essay on, 84–142; works of, as index of character, 84; receives Hebrew instruction from father, 84; studies at *heder*, 85; studies Talmud, 86; studies under Samuel Meyer Ehrenberg, 86; denial of Messiah condemned as abandonment of Judaism, 86; acquires elegant and correct Hebrew style, 87; attends gymnasium at Wolfenbuttel, 87; studies philosophy and philology at Berlin, 87; receives degree from Halle University, 87; problems of Jewish science and, 88; epoch-making essay on Rashi, 89, 100–1; connection with *Verein fuer Cultur und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, 90; appeals for the creation of institutions of learning, 90; and superficial rationalism of period, 91; love for Judaism, 93; personal characteristics of, 93; not popular with masses, 93; attacks on *Parnasim* (lay heads), 93–4, 114; uncom-

promising in sarcasm, 93; contempt for arrogance of rich, 94–5; lack of knowledge condemned by, 95; complains of Jewish indifference, 96–7; complains of attitude of educated classes towards Rabbis and their work, 98; task of restoring Jewish scholarship, 98; *Gottesdienstliche Vortraege*, analyzed, 99; slight prejudices against Rabbinic literature, 99; defends Rabbinic literature, 100; *Gottesdienstliche Vortraege der Juden*, by, appears in 1832, 101; *G. V.*, contains possibly Rappoport's ideas on Midrashic literature, 101; Geiger, Samiler, Chajes on learning of, 101–2; Caro translates *G. V.* into Hebrew, 102; activities of, 102; influences study of special branches of Jewish science, 101; on Oral and Written Law, 104; other literary works, *Die Zur Geschichte und Literatur*, 105, 130–2; *Die Synagogale Poesie*, 105; *Der Ritus des Synagogole Gottesdienst*, 105, 133–5; *Literaturgeschichte der Synagogalen Poesie*, considered the greatest authority on subject, describes over 6,000 liturgical pieces, 107; on importance of Oral Law, 108; Bible exegesis of, 108; fixing of date and place of *Midrashim*, 108; love of, accuracy and thoroughness, 109; on prophecy and Haggadah, both national expressions of religious life of Jews, 109; on Judaism as continuous revelation, 110; on the Bible and religious literature as testimony of Jewish creed, 110; aversion to Karaites, 111; aversion to anti-Rabbinic tendencies, 111; love of Jewish nation, 111; quotation from, used by George Eliot, 111; opposed to views of Judaism of Mordecai in *Daniel Deronda* 112; on God as the soul of Israel, 112; as preacher, 111, 144; in Berlin and Prague, 113; published sermons of, 114; relation to *Parnasim*, 114; impatience with ritual questions, 114; zealous regard for Judaism, 114; on the two institutions of the synagogue, praying and teaching, 115; influence on religious thought of time of, 116; attains old age, 116; works for the emancipation of the spirit, 116; death of wife of, 117; comfort in study of science of Judaism, 117; marginal notes on books by, 136–7; as Rabbi, 144; epitaphs on tombstone of, 142–3; library of, at Ramsgate, 136.

See also Gottesdienstliche Vortraege.

Zunz, Menahem, father of Leopold Zunz, alluded to, 84.

Zur Geschichte und Literatur, uncorrected essays by Zunz, 105–6. brief analysis of contents of, 130–7.